THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS,

IN

GREEK AND ENGLISH,

WITH AN ANALYSIS AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY.

BY

SAMUEL H. TURNER, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LEARNING AND INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE IN THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AND OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN COLUMBIA COLLEGE, N. Y.

NEW YORK:

STANFORD AND SWORDS, 137, BROADWAY.

1852.

Billin and Brothers,
Printers and Stereotypers, 20 North William St., New York.

INTRODUCTION.

It may seem superfluous to offer to the Church an exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in addition to the many and valuable works illustrative of that portion of Holy Scripture which already exist. But even the best may contain some objectionable matter, or may omit a suitable notice of certain points of interest and importance; or, some circumstances may make it expedient to bring forward prominently doctrinal or practical considerations clearly maintained in the Epistle, while others may make the publication of an additional commentary not only proper but obligatory. These considerations combined have had their influence in inducing me to issue this small volume on the Hebrews, and even to express an intention to follow it by other similar publications on the New Testament, if they shall appear to be wanted.

The Greek text follows the edition of Hahn, as printed by Professor Robinson, the punctuation being in a few instances slightly altered. In the analysis and notes, I have endeavoured to explain the Epistle by giving the reader the results of some little examination, rather than to present him with a long array of writers to whom but few have access, and whom still fewer would take the trouble to study. I have, however, laid before him the reasons also for the results, or the process by which they are thought to be sustained. I am not aware of being influenced by any other motive than a desire to present conscientiously what I believe to be the true meaning of the inspired writer. And so far as this may have been done, I would humbly hope for the divine blessing; and wherein it has failed, not less humbly trust in that infinite mercy which "winks at ignorance," and is not "extreme to mark what is done amiss."

It is well known that the Epistle to the Hebrews has given

rise to many inquiries, which have called forth very many critical and learned discussions. The inquisitive reader who wishes to investigate the various topics alluded to, must consult Introductions to the New Testament, such as Horne's or Hug's, or that of John David Michaelis; or commentators whose purpose may have led them into so wide a field, of whom it may be sufficient to mention Professor Stuart of our own country, and Kuinoel and Tholuck of Germany,* learned, pious and candid men, although on some points they have come to different results. It is not my intention to enter into such disquisitions, which would oblige me to extend my book to an inordinate size. Still it is proper to mention a few of the topics. They are such as these.

Is the work properly an epistle or an instructive religious discourse? This point is really of very little consequence, as its decision does not affect in any degree the statements, doctrines, arguments, or practical bearing of the work. Although it does not take the usual form of a letter in the commencement, the general internal evidence confirms the probability of its being what it has always been called, *The Epistle* to the Hebrews.

To whom was the work addressed? To all the Hebrew nation, both in their own land and dispersed in various countries, whether converted to the Gospel or not? Or to Jews of Palestine or some other particular locality? Certain texts in St. Peter have been supposed to favour the theory that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Christian Churches, composed chiefly of Jewish converts, which at that time existed in various parts of Asia Minor. In his second Epistle, iii. 15, he says that his brother Paul had written to those whom he was addressing, and a comparison of the first verse of the same chapter with the first verse of the former Epistle, shows that they were Christians of those provinces. But the argument assumes that the first of these texts refers to this Epistle, whereas it is more probable that the allusion is to some of St. Paul's smaller letters. Neither does a comparison of Heb. ii. 2 with Gal. iii. 19, both of which speak of the agency of angels in giving the law, prove, as some have supposed, any such connection between the two Epistles; for St. Stephen states the same thing in Acts vii. 53, and

* A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, by Moses Stuart. Second Edition, Andover, 1833: Kommentar zum Briefe an die Hebraer, von Dr. A. Tholuck. Hamburg, 1836. A new edition appeared in 1840. This work, translated into English by Hamilton and Ryland, makes the 38th and 39th volumes of Clark's Biblical Cabinet. Edinb. 1842: D. Christ. Theoph. Kuinoel Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebræos. Lips. 1831.

it is founded on Deut. xxxiii. 2, and would very properly be used in addressing Jews any where. These arguments are alleged by Kuettner, and introduced from him by Peile in his late work on the Hebrews.* They are evidently inconclusive. It is enough to learn from the contents of the Epistle, that it was addressed to Hebrews who had been converted to Christianity, but were in danger of apostatizing; with the collateral view also of impressing the truths of the Gospel on their unbelieving brethren who might have an opportunity of reading it.

The genuineness and canonical authority of the book have been the subjects of learned disquisition, and Christian antiquity has been thoroughly searched, and its testimony largely adduced. The result is a satisfactory decision in its favour, affording evidence of the care of the primitive Church not to admit any work into the canon, unless on incontrovertible proof of its legitimate claim to such distinction.

The language in which it was written has also been a point of investigation. Many of the fathers assert it to have been the Hebrew. But the opinion rather seems to have been assumed on the supposition that this was the vernacular tongue of the nation, and consequently that the Greek would have been an unsuitable medium of communication. On the other hand it has been shown that Greek as well as Hebrew was sufficiently understood for all practical purposes by the body of the Hebrews.† Besides, not a vestige of the Epistle in the Hebrew language has been transmitted from an early age, and the work does not exhibit any indication of being a version, but on the contrary looks in all respects like an original. Those who wish to know what has been said in defence of the opinion referred to, may consult the introduction of J. D. Michaelis, translated by Bishop Marsh, chap. xxiv. sect. 8–12, vol.

* Annotations on the Apostolical Epistles, by Williamson Peile, D. D. Vol. III. Thessalonians—Hebrews. Lond. 1851. This is a work of considerable labour. It contains many important quotations, particularly from Calvin. The parallel texts, though frequently exceedingly apposite, are too numerous, and occasionally have little or no bearing on the point to be elucidated. The expositions too are sometimes quite obscure; and the style is so involved and parenthetical, that, even with the aid of all the appliances of italics, capital letters, and dashes, it often requires the closest attention in order to elicit the meaning.

† In reference to this subject I refer the reader to the work of the learned Neapolitan, Dominic Deodati, entitled: De Christo Græce loquente Exercitatio, published at Naples in 1767, and edited with a Preface by Orlando T. Dobbin, LL. B. London 1843, 12mo: Also, to the treatise by Professor Pfannkuche on the prevalence of the Aramæan language in Palestine in the age of Christ and his Apostles; and to that of Hug in his Introduction, on the prevalence of the Greek in the same country and period. These treatises have been translated into English and may be found in the Biblical Repository, Andover 1831, vol. I. No. II. Art. iv., and No. III. Art. v.

iv. pp. 211–234, London, 1802; also, "An Essay to discover the author of the Epistle and the language in which it was originally written, by Joseph Hallett, junr., Lond. 1733," Sec. II.*

The time of writing the Epistle has also been a subject of examination. It is pretty generally agreed, however, among critics, that its date must be placed anterior to the destruction of Jerusalem.

The most important and interesting inquiry of the sort above mentioned relates to the authorship of this Epistle. Hallett in the first section of the Essay just mentioned, Michaelis, Horne, Hug, and other writers of Introductions to the New Testament, have discussed the subject at length. Stuart and Tholuck, in the Introductions to their respective commentaries, are particularly worthy of attention. They have examined whatever antiquity contains which seems to bear upon this inquiry, and also the whole structure, arrangement, style and peculiarities of the Epistle; in a word, whatever may serve to characterise and identify the writer. The conclusion to which the former arrives is that the author is St. Paul; while, according to the latter, the probabilities are in favour of Apollos. To these learned commentators I must refer the reader, confining myself to such a brief notice as seems necessary.

The opinions of the leading writers of the early church varied as much respecting the authorship of this Epistle, as they did on the length of our Lord's ministry. In the latter part of the second century and beginning of the third, St. Luke was by some, and Clement of Rome by others, considered as the author. See Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. vi. 25. Clement of Alexandria regarded the present Epistle as a translation by St. Luke of St. Paul's original Hebrew work: Eus. vi. 14, who also remarks that some attributed the translation to Clement of Rome: iii. 38. Tertullian† quotes vi. 4–8 from the Epistle, which he ascribes to Barnabas, the apostle. If it were credible that the production generally known as the epistle of Barnabas, and published among the apostolical fathers, were the work of the friend and companion of St. Paul, it would be quite certain that such a writer could not be the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. A candid and intelligent man has only to read the

* This Essay is an introduction to "A Paraphrase and Notes on the three last chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews; being a supplement to the learned Mr. Peirce's Paraphrase and Notes on this epistle." The author referred to is the Rev. James Peirce of Eton, a dissenting minister, who died before he had completed his work on the Hebrews. It is a laborious production, and in some respects learned; though, as it seems to me, occasionally extravagant in its expositions, and wanting in that plain, good sense, without which no commentator can thoroughly enter into the character and meaning of his original.

† De Pudicitia, xx. p. 582. Opera, Edit. Rigalt. Paris. 1675.

two, in order to satisfy himself that the mind which conceived the thoughts, and adjusted the arguments of the canonical Epistle, could not have come down to the well-meaning puerilities and far-fetched analogies of the so called apostolical book. But as the authenticity and genuineness of the letter ascribed to Barnabas are without valid support either of external or internal evidence, no argument can be drawn from a comparison of the two.

The most generally received opinion undoubtedly of the Christian church is, that St. Paul was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Clement of Alexandria,* Origen,† Eusebius,‡ Jerome,§ and the leading ecclesiastical writers, concur in this sentiment. The difference of style from that of the other well-known writings of this apostle, and the absence of his usual introduction, have been adduced in opposition to this theory; and this discrepancy had so great an influence on the acute and critical mind of Origen as to lead him to adopt the opinion that the thoughts were St. Paul's, but the language that of some other writer. His view may be seen in Eusebius, vi. 25. It appears to be at least as probable as any that has been advanced, and best adapted to harmonize the leading external evidence with that suggested by the style and manner of the work. Tholuck remarks that Luther first ascribed the authorship to Apollos; and this, as I have already said, is his own opinion. Nevertheless, the reader will find in his introduction a very full and clear exhibition of the arguments, both external and internal, in defence of the ancient view of Clement of Alexandria. He does not appear to have withheld any consideration of importance which might be thought to favour the claim of St. Paul, and is entitled to great respect for the ability and candour with which he has conducted the whole investigation.

One thing is certain, and it is a fact of the very greatest importance. The Epistle to the Hebrews was regarded by the early church as the work of an apostle or apostolic man. As such it was received by the Christian community as an embodiment of Christian doctrines, and publicly read as such in the congregations. It was appealed to as an exponent of Gospel truth. Whatever doubt therefore may exist respecting its author, it stands out prominently as a Christian work of authority, as early at least as the year

* Eus. vi. 14.

† Id. vi. 25.

‡ Id. iii. 3. I have confined my reference to Eusebius, chiefly to avoid a multiplicity of authorities.

§ Catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers, under Paul. Opera, Tom. iv. col. 103. Edit. Paris. 1706.

seventy; and consequently the doctrinal views which it contains are those of the apostles and leading followers of Christ who lived in that age. To represent the book as the production of a narrow-minded Alexandrine Jewish convert, is as much in contradiction to historical record, as it plainly is to the whole nature and character of the work itself.

The evident design of the Epistle is to confirm and establish the faith of the Hebrew Christians who had been exposed to persecutions, and were in danger of apostasy. With this view the author presents to their consideration the excellence of the Gospel, particularly in contradistinction to the law. As the Mosaic system was introduced through the agency of angels, he shows the superiority of the author of Christianity to these celestial beings, both in his original divine nature and in the elevation of his human to universal supremacy. He compares the respective heads of the two dispensations, acknowledging the fidelity of Moses, but representing him as a servant merely, while Christ is the distinguished Son. He compares at large the priestly and sacrificial character and actions of our Lord with those under the law, pointing out the weakness and inadequacy of the latter, and stating fully, with suitable evidence and illustrations, the sufficiency and perfection of the former. He intersperses these discussions with most important instructions on various kindred topics, and with serious and affecting exhortations and warnings. He exhibits the practical value of faith, and displays the superior excellency of the Gospel to the law, as an incentive to an unwavering adherence to a religion so glorious and divine, and undeviating obedience to its demands. It is impossible to read the work with attention and candour without a firm conviction that the author has accomplished his task with complete success.

ANALYSIS

OF THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

SECTION I.

Chap. I. II.

INTRODUCTION: CHRIST'S SUPERIORITY TO ANGELS.

The author begins by stating that God, who formerly communicated religious truths to the ancestors of the Hebrews, in various times and manners, by means of the prophets, hath, in proclaiming the Gospel dispensation, spoken to their descendants by his incarnate Son. Of this personage in his human condition, he declares that God hath appointed him universal Lord, and that by his instrumentality in his original divine condition the universe was created. He affirms also, that being as intimately like the Supreme as the bright ray is like the glorious substance from which it emanates, and the stamp is like the seal or die which produces it, and sustaining, moreover, all creation by his omnipotent command, yet having nevertheless by himself, in his incarnate state, made an atonement for man's sins, he was, as a reward, elevated to the very highest dignity in heaven: i. 1–3.

The commencement of this Epistle comprehends in brief the main points of the composition, and, indeed, of the whole Gospel. It develops the deity and humanity of Christ; his Sonship as to both natures; his voluntary humiliation in human nature even unto death; its atoning and sacrificial character; and his glorious exaltation in the same nature to universal supremacy.

The writer then proceeds to discuss the first leading topic of his work, and to show Christ's superiority to the angels.

He has been made as much superior to the angels, as he has obtained, in the capacity of incarnate Son, a more distinguished name and honour than they. For no angel was ever addressed in so honourable a manner,

and with such circumstances of dignity, as the Messiah. He is said, in consequence of his resurrection, to be God's Son; either by a figure as if born from the dead, or as declared to be such by that commencement of his glorification, his resurrection, which is the miraculous proof of his divine mission, and which publicly announces him to the universe. In him does the divine promise to David centre, namely, that in his family God would raise up a royal seed or progeny, of whom he would be in the highest sense the father, and whom he would recognise as his most dearly beloved son. Him also, when he raised him from the dead, he required all the angels to worship, even the most exalted and nearest the throne of the Infinite and Eternal: 4–7. It is true, indeed, that in the Scriptures God does speak of angels in honourable terms; but still they are represented as his agents, like the powers of nature, the winds, for instance, or the lightnings. But, on the contrary, the language addressed to the Son is of a very different kind. He is spoken of as the most dignified king, whose authority is everlasting; as a divine king to whom belong the attributes and nature of God; as a ruler distinguished for the equity and righteousness of his government, arising from the essential characteristics of his nature, in consequence of which God hath exalted him to a state of supremacy and happiness above that of all those who exercise royal authority whether on earth or in heaven: 8–9. And the original divinity of this glorious personage is further shown in the language of the Psalmist, who speaks of him as the creator of heaven and earth, the being who shall remain for ever immutable, however transient and changeable may be all other things: 10–12. No angel or archangel, he alone in his human nature has been seated in glory at God's right hand, where he awaits the subjection of his enemies. The whole body of the angelic hosts are but spiritual agents, subserving the plan of God, by contributing to the aid and service of those who shall eventually be saved: 13–14.

Such a statement, so simple, and yet so sublime and comprehensive, naturally prepares us for the author's serious and solemn inference. We ought, therefore, to attend most carefully to the Gospel which has been proclaimed to us, and not suffer its important truths to glide away from our understandings and affections unimproved. This argument derives additional force from the consideration, that the contemner of the Mosaic law, which was introduced by the agency of angels with circumstances of imposing and awful solemnity, paid the severe penalty of his transgression without the possibility of favour. Much less can they expect to escape punishment who neglect the great and distinguishing salvation, which was first proclaimed by Christ himself, and then by his immediate disciples, who had received their instructions from his own lips, God attesting the truth of their doctrines by various miracles and divine gifts, communicated according to his own will by the Holy Spirit: ii. 1–4.

Having remarked that the Mosaic dispensation was introduced by the agency of angels, the author now proceeds with the general topic which he had commenced in the former chapter; and while he states the humanity of the Messiah, affirms his superiority, even in this human nature, to the very angels whose instrumentality in promulging the law contributed to illustrate its glory. Messiah's kingdom has not been subjected to the control of angels. It is man whom the Psalmist represents as kindly regarded by God, and who, although created originally somewhat lower than angels, is nevertheless in his nature not vastly inferior to those spiritual beings; in his primitive condition, lord of all earthly things; and, in the person of the Messiah, this same nature is elevated to absolute supremacy over the universe. The meaning of the Psalmist, when fully developed, may be fully represented thus: The subjection which his language comprehends, although in reference to Adam and his posterity generally it is restricted to sublunary things, is nevertheless, in reference to human nature itself, absolutely unlimited both in extent and degree. But, says the Apostle, we do not yet see all things thus subjected to man. It is only in human nature as existing in the person of Jesus that we can discern the application of the full meaning of the Psalm. We see him, who by taking upon him human nature did become inferior to angels, raised to universal supremacy as a consequence of his voluntary degradation to death, which, through the mercy of God, he suffered for every one: 5–9. And it accords with the character and conduct of God, on account of whom and by whom all things were made and subsist, that, in glorifying his numerous redeemed children, he should elevate to the very highest supremacy their great leader and head as a reward for his sufferings. And thus both he that makes the atonement, and they that are thereby reconciled to God, are sons of the same father, and therefore, although Saviour and Lord, he condescends to regard them as his brethren. Hence it is that the Scriptures represent him as honouring and praising the great parent of all among the fellow-members of God's Church; as expressing his trust in his heavenly Father; and as recognising his disciples as dear children whom God had given him. Inasmuch, then, as the children partake of human nature, he also assumed the same, in order that, by submitting to death in that nature, he might demolish the usurped power of the devil, and deliver those who had always been enslaved and disturbed with terrific apprehensions. For as he did not undertake to assist angels, but the progeny of faithful Abraham, it was proper and in character with his design that he should be in general like his brethren. And this, in order that he might become a compassionate and faithful high-priest, so as to propitiate for sin. And, moreover, inasmuch as he hath experienced the evils of temptation, he is the better able to succour those who are exposed to the same distresses: 10–18.

SECTION II.

Chap. III.—VI.

CHRIST AS HEAD OF GOD'S CHURCH SUPERIOR TO MOSES; WITH INSTRUCTIONS AND EXHORTATIONS.

The Apostle now enters on the second part of his subject. After showing briefly the superiority of Christ, as the founder of the Christian dispensation, to Moses as head of the Hebrew, he avails himself of the occasion, to impress the obligation of attending properly to the Gospel. His argument implies that the land of Canaan, which had been promised to the patriarchs as the pleasant residence of their posterity, was a symbol of Messiah's kingdom begun on earth and continued everlastingly in heaven.

He commences with the most affectionate address, founded on the relation to God which his forefathers had sustained, and which their spiritual descendants still enjoyed. He regards his brethren as persons consecrated to the service of God, and partakers of Christian privileges heavenly in their origin, nature, and ultimate perfection. He urges them to consider attentively Jesus, who sustains the dignified offices of apostle and high-priest, and who is faithful to God, by whom he had been appointed thereto, as Moses is also said to have been faithful in all God's house or family, the Church of old. He strengthens his exhortation by pointing out the superior excellency of this extraordinary personage. He is to be regarded as more honourable even than faithful Moses, in the same proportion as the builder is more so than the house which he hath builded, or any part of it, or the founder of the family more worthy of regard than the members. This illustration implies his divinity, which had been maintained in the first chapter, and therefore the parenthetical remark is introduced, that, as every house or family has some builder or founder, so he that constituted and founded all things, is really divine. But the Messiah's superiority does not depend solely on his essential divinity. As God's agents, a comparison between Moses as head of the Hebrew dispensation and Jesus of the Christian, shows the greater dignity of the latter. Moses indeed was faithful in all God's Church as his servant, and in this capacity he testified to those truths which were afterwards to be fully revealed; but Christ was faithful as Son over God's Church, of which we continue to be rightful members, provided we hold fast our original hope boldly and confidently to the end: iii. 1–6.

Having thus drawn out this comparison, and represented the superior greatness of Christ to Moses, he takes occasion from the statements just

made to exhort the Hebrew Christians to guard against the advance of such a disposition of mind as might tend in any degree to apostacy. He founds his exhortation on the language of David in the 95th Psalm. It is uncertain whether he means to clothe his own address in the words of the Psalm, or merely to introduce them as containing a monition to the ancient Hebrews, similar to that which he immediately afterwards commences to those of his own age. David, speaking by the influence of the Spirit, exhorts his nation not to neglect their religious blessings, and thus harden their hearts as did their forefathers, who tried and provoked God in the wilderness, where he miraculously sustained them forty years, during which period, in consequence of their infidelity and habitual disregard of their benefactor, they were made to wander therein, until the solemn threat that they should fall in that wilderness and never enter with Joshua into the rest promised in Canaan was accomplished. This exhortation of the royal Psalmist is extended in the Epistle: Take heed, brethren, lest a wicked, unbelieving disposition lead you to apostatize. On the contrary, whilst time and opportunity are still afforded you, exhort one another continually, that sin may not harden you by its deceitful insinuations; (for we continue to partake of the blessings of a union with Christ on the condition of steadfast and permanent adherence to our original confidence;) whilst the language of the Psalm is applicable to your condition, do not, like your unbelieving ancestors, become obdurate and impenitent. For, consider who they were that after hearing God's offers of kindness provoked him. Was it not the whole body of those who came from Egypt under the direction of Moses? With whom was he indignant forty years? Was it not with that whole sinful generation whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? To whom did he swear that they should not enter into that rest of his, but to the faithless? The general prevalence of the guilt did not affect the certainty and universality of the punishment: 7–18.

Thus we see that they could not enter into the promised rest on account of their obdurate unbelief. Therefore let their example be a warning to us, and let us fear lest, by any possibility, we should fail in attaining that rest of God, the promise of which has been left to us: 19, iv. 1. The threat denounced against the unbelieving race in the wilderness, although relating ostensibly to the secure and peaceable possession of the land of Canaan, implies that they who persevere in their impenitence and unbelief shall be excluded from the enjoyment of that heavenly rest of which it was a symbol; and the exhortation also of David is founded on the same principle. Having in view this ultimate application of the term, the author proceeds: For we have glad tidings proclaimed to us as they also had, but the declarations which they heard were unprofitable for want of faith in the hearers. For, in all ages, it is believers only who enter into that ultimate and divine and holy rest which God designates as *properly his*. Thus, when he says,

they shall not enter into *my rest*, he means, rest from labours, such rest as he is represented as enjoying when he had finished the work of creation, and therefore it is said, *my rest*: 2–5.—Keeping in view now the statement before made, that the rest in the land of Canaan was emblematic of heavenly rest, and therefore, that in the use of the word a transfer from the one idea to the other might naturally take place, we may the more readily follow the author's train of thought. As God's rest is undoubtedly to be attained by some—although the impenitent and unbelieving, to whom it was formerly offered, failed to secure it—the Holy Spirit again, by the mouth of David, and therefore long after the Hebrews had been settled in Canaan, designates a certain period then existing, and exhorts them during that very period to repentance and faith and obedience, in order that they might secure the rest which was to come in the kingdom of glory. For, surely, had there been no other rest in contemplation but that acquired through the agency of Joshua, David would not have spoken of another period than that antecedent to the entrance into the promised land, to be employed in preparing for admission thereto. There must, therefore, be a holy and future state of rest and enjoyment, to bless the people of God. And he who hath entered into that rest of God, hath ceased from his own toilsome works, as God is said to have done from those which were proper to him: 6–10.—He then renews his exhortation to earnest endeavour, appealing again to the example before adduced, and also to a due regard to God's revealed declarations, which he characterizes as energetic, and, like a two-edged sword, keen and powerful, penetrating through the very inmost soul. Then, by an easy transfer to God their author, he represents every creature as entirely and thoroughly manifest to him, who will call them to account: 11–13.

The author now renews his exhortation to his Hebrew brethren, founded on a consideration which he had advanced at the conclusion of the first part of his work. He again introduces Jesus, the Son of God, as a priest of no ordinary character, one who hath passed through the heavens, and who, in the most exalted and glorious condition, acts as our celestial high-priest. On these accounts, he urges them to adhere firmly to that profession of Christianity which they had formerly made. Dignified as this our high-priest is, he is also able to sympathize with our weaknesses, since he had been tempted in all respects like ourselves, except so far as our sinfulness would make a difference. On both these grounds, then, the distinguished and celestial exaltation and the sympathetic character of this sacerdotal personage, he invites to approach the gracious majesty of God, in order to receive his proffered mercy, and to obtain favour for seasonable assistance: 14–16. He then proceeds to describe in part the nature of the priestly office, why it was constituted, and what duties and rights it involves. Every high-priest is a human officer, appointed in the place and on the

behalf of men to act in relation to God, to present their grateful acknowledgments, and to offer propitiatory sacrifices for sins. Being himself pressed by human infirmities, he is able to compassionate ignorant and inconsiderate wanderers; and, for the same reason, it becomes necessary to offer atonement for himself as well as for the people. The honour of this office cannot be assumed by any one. He alone can rightfully undertake it who is divinely called thereto, as Aaron was. And accordingly, Christ did not glorify himself in becoming a self-constituted high-priest, but was invested with this commission by him who, in raising him from the dead, publicly announced him as his honourable and glorified Son; as he declared also in the 110th Psalm, Thou art a priest, unchangeable and everlasting, according to the rank and likeness of Melchisedek. In the time of his humiliation and incarnate condition, although he offered up most earnest entreaties and supplications to his God, who was able to save him from the sorrows which he deprecated, and was heard and delivered from the anguish of soul which so exceedingly overwhelmed him; yet, though he were Son, and therefore high in favour and chief in affection, he learned, from the sufferings which he sustained, to experience what it was to obey the requisitions of his holy Father's will. And, as a reward for the obedience which he yielded, he was elevated to the most exalted and glorious distinction, that of being lord of the universe, by consequence of which he became the cause and author of everlasting salvation to all who obey him, having been publicly proclaimed by God high-priest according to the rank of Melchisedek: v. 1–10.

Respecting this person, proceeds the writer, I have much to say, which it may be difficult to explain to you so as to make it perfectly intelligible and clear; owing, not so much to the obscurity of the subject, as to your dulness and inattention. For whilst, if we consider the length of time which has elapsed since you embraced the Gospel, you ought to be so thoroughly acquainted with its doctrines as to be competent to teach others, you require to be taught again yourselves its very elementary principles, and are like children who require milk, and cannot digest strong food. I have employed this figure, because every weak and inexperienced Christian, who may in this respect be compared with the feeble infant that imbibes its mother's milk, cannot understand and appreciate the doctrine of righteousness, or the full religious system of Christ. He cannot bear it yet. This must be reserved for the more advanced, who have grown in the grace of the Gospel, and who may be likened to persons of mature age, whose perceptive faculties, by habitual exercise, enable them to distinguish between good and evil: 11–14.

Although the Apostle has spoken in the most general terms of the Hebrews whom he is addressing, yet it is not to be doubted that his language must be taken with considerable limitations, both as to the degree of inex-

perience intended and the extent of the censure implied. A letter designed for large communities could hardly be otherwise understood. What follows, therefore, is not at all inconsistent with the representation just made. The first word of the original, which is an illative particle, is evidently in logical dependence with what goes before. It may be thus connected with the remark that he had much matter to discourse of, but it is most closely allied with what immediately precedes. Thus: As every disciple is presumed to be desirous of advancing in Christian knowledge and character, let us leave the elements of our religion, and proceed to a more perfect development of the true nature of Christianity. Let us not again lay the foundation, repentance namely from sin which brings death and ruin, faith in God as the great object of hope and trust, the doctrine of Christian baptism, the open avowal and confirmation of it in the apostolic rite of the imposition of hands, the resurrection, and the final judgment, the award of which is to be permanent. He proposes, therefore, to proceed in his course of instruction. I will do this, if God permit. The reason of this resolve immediately follows, namely, to strengthen them in the faith, so as to prevent them from apostatizing. He depicts the horrours of such a condition, by affirming the impossibility, or at least the extreme difficulty, of recovery. They whose souls have been once enlightened, who have been "called out of darkness into God's marvellous light,"* and "taught by" him,† either through the ordinary or extraordinary means which he may employ; who have imbibed with inward satisfaction the heavenly communications of the Holy Spirit, and partaken of them in common with their Christian brethren; they who have enjoyed the good "word of God which by the Gospel hath been preached unto"‡ them, and the energetic influences of the Messiah's dispensation; and who yet have apostatized from the truth and relapsed into their former condition of sin and errour; they cannot at all, or, if at all, not without extreme difficulty, be brought again to a state of repentance and grace. The reason is plain. They show an obdurate, insensible condition of heart, and, by exposing Christianity to shame and ignominy, may be said to crucify a second time the Son of God, and to expose him to public disgrace: vi. 1–6.

This fearful representation of the result of indifference, neglect, and abuse of long enjoyed privileges, is illustrated by a comparison drawn from agriculture. The soil that kindly drinketh in the frequent shower, and consequently beareth its productions suited to the wants of those for whom it is cultivated, is made abundantly fertile by the blessing of God. But, on the contrary, the ground which, in accordance with the primitive sentence, beareth nothing but briers and thorns, being suffered to lie waste as unworthy of tillage, is exposed to the curse, and at last its brambles and

* 1 Pet. ii. 9. † John vi. 45. Isa. liv. 13. ‡ 1 Pet. i. 25.

thorns are all burned and utterly consumed. Fit emblem of the obdurate sinner, whose life has been spent in uselessness or wickedness, and whose end is "destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."* With the view of softening the seeming harshness of the implied censure, the author most affectionately proceeds as follows. But of you, beloved, I cherish a better hope, even that of your everlasting salvation, although, with the truest regard for your welfare, I address you in this very plain and direct manner. For God, "who will render to every man according to his deeds,"† cannot forget those Christian labours of love which, in order to promote his glory, you have performed, and are still performing, for the benefit of his saints. As you have done good unto any of your Saviour's brethren, you "shall in no wise lose your reward."‡ Only I am exceedingly desirous that every one of you, without exception, shall show the same earnestness and diligent attention to Christian character and conduct, so as to secure such a full confidence of hope as shall continue to the end of life; that ye be not sluggish and indifferent, but imitators of those ancient worthies who, through the exercise of faith and patient endurance, now enjoy the reality of the divine promises. For when God confirmed his promise to Abraham, he sware by himself, than whom no greater being could possibly be conceived of, saying, I will most certainly bless thee, and exceedingly multiply thy progeny: and so, after having patiently endured the trials of a long series of years, he in the end obtained the accomplishment of the divine declaration. For as men do indeed generally sware by some object superior to themselves, and an oath which is intended to confirm some statement usually terminates all opposition; so God, desirous the more fully to show those faithful children of Abraham whom his promises were intended to comprehend the immutability of his most benevolent will, interposed between his word and the weakness of their faith by a confirmatory oath. Thus it follows that, by means of God's promise and his oath, two immutable things as necessarily true as the divine nature itself, we, who have fled from the ruin threatened as the consequence of sin, in order to seize and hold fast the hope offered in the Gospel, may have a solid and well-supported comfort. And we have this hope, both unfailing and sure, which, like an anchor, keeps the soul secure among the storms of life, being firmly fixed in heaven, that divine sanctuary where God especially displays his presence and dispenses his blessings, and which the holy of holies of the tabernacle beyond the inner veil was a symbol. There our forerunner Jesus hath already preceded us; he hath entered into the highest heaven, where he pleads in our behalf the merits of his atoning sacrifice, and intercedes for us with his father, having become an everlasting high-priest, according to the rank and likeness of Melchisedek: 7–20.

* 1 Thess. i. 9. † Rom. ii. 6. ‡ Matt. x. 42.

SECTION III.

Chap. VII.

THE DIGNITY OF CHRIST'S PRIESTHOOD SHOWN FROM ITS ANALOGY TO THAT OF MELCHISEDEK AND FROM OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES.

Chap. vii.—In this chapter the Apostle enters upon the subject of the comparison of Christ's priesthood with that of Melchisedek, in order to show thereby its superiority to that of the Mosaic system. With this view he speaks first of the greatness of Melchisedek, in his person, character, and functions; representing him as superior to Abraham, the most honoured ancestor and patriarch of the Hebrews, and therefore incomparably greater than any of his descendants. Thus he lays a foundation for his conclusion, that the priesthood of Christ, which was prophetically announced to be like Melchisedek, is also incomparably superior to the Jewish. And this result he confirms by other circumstantial evidence.

This Melchisedek, whose name indicates his character as a righteous ruler; king of a place called Salem, which conveys the idea of peace and happiness; who was also a priest of Jehovah; who met and blessed Abraham, and received from him the acknowledgment of precedence in the payment of tithes; whose priestly office and person are not registered among the lists of Hebrew priests, and who, in the Psalms, is declared to be like the Son of God; is so, in this respect, that his priesthood centres entirely in his own person, belongs to him exclusively, there being in his priestly office neither predecessor nor successor to the one only priest of it, Melchisedek, who fills up its entire period in his own individual person: 1–3. Observe the dignity of this sacred character, whose distinction was submissively recognised even by the distinguished patriarch. The Levitical priests are legally authorized to receive tithes of their brethren. But, in this case, God's high-priest tithed and blessed even the favoured Abraham, thus proving his own superiority. The former class of priestly receivers is a series of men dying and leaving their office to their successors; but this priest lives and exercises the sacred functions of his priesthood during its whole period. And it might even be said that Levi, the father of that race whom the laws allowed to take tithes, did himself pay them in the person of his ancestor: 4–10. This prophetic recognition of another priest, who was to be in a most essential point like Melchisedek, and unlike the Levitical priestly race, is evidence of the inadequacy of this sacerdotal system. For if the Jewish priesthood could have effected what the fallen condition of man required, there would have been no necessity

to purpose and predict the establishment of another. The prediction implies a change of the priesthood, and as this and the law were indissolubly connected, it follows, that the change of the former brings along with it a change also of the latter. And it is so: for the person of whom this prediction was made belonged to a tribe which exercised no priestly functions. For it is evident that he sprang from Judah; (or, For this is evident, because he sprang from Judah,) which tribe had no legal claim to any sacerdotal character. And more evident still is it, the evidence is corroborated and made indubitable, inasmuch as it is predicted that a priest shall arise like Melchisedek, whose nature and functions are not in accordance with a system of perishable outward observances, but in accordance with a divine life which is indestructible, since he is an everlasting priest of the rank of Melchisedek: 11–17. The preceding law could not offer the atonement, nor procure the satisfaction, reconciliation, peace of conscience, and grace to serve God acceptably, which were essential. It was, therefore, annulled on account of its inadequacy to meet the exigency of the case, and the Gospel was substituted, which introduced a better and a secure hope, thus enabling us to approach God with a well-founded confidence: 18, 19. Furthermore, the solemnity of an oath which was peculiar to the prediction of Christ's everlasting priesthood, is a circumstance which illustrates the superiority of the dispensation with which it is connected to that which preceded. And so also is the mortality and transitory character of the many Levitical priests contrasted with the permanency of Christ, in consequence of which his priesthood never passes away. It continues always in himself, and therefore he is able to continue saving all believers in him to the end of time, since his glorious and intercessory life in heaven continues for ever: 20–25. He is also in moral character and in dignity to which he is elevated, exactly suited to our wants, having no need, like the Jewish high-priests, to offer habitually, for his one offering of himself sufficed: 26, 27. In one word, the law makes weak and sinful men high-priests; but the oath announced in the person of David, constitutes the holy and exalted and eternally glorified Son God's everlasting high-priest.

SECTION IV.

CHAP. VIII.—X. 18.

CHRIST AS PRIEST AND SACRIFICE SUPERIOR TO THOSE OF THE LAW.

In this section the comparison which the connection of the priesthood of Christ with that of Melchisedek suggested is drawn out in detail. The general contents of the eighth chapter are as follows. Among the subjects spoken of one most important point is this, that our high-priest is so dignified that he exercises his functions in heaven: 1, 2. As it appertains to the office of a high-priest to offer to God gifts and sacrifices, so, to preserve the analogy, this one also must have his offering. Had the exercise of his office been confined merely to earth, he would not have been a priest, inasmuch as the Levitical priests could legitimately have performed the duties required by such a connection, who do the services of the imperfect Jewish dispensation, which was a mere type of the Christian. But Christ hath obtained a much better ministration associated with better promises. For if the first dispensation had been perfectly adapted to attain the necessary end, there could have been no occasion for a second. But this is not the case, for Jeremiah predicts the introduction of a new and more spiritual and perfect dispensation which should supersede the other: 3–13.

The author now proceeds to describe the Jewish tabernacles, with some of their sacred furniture. He particularly notes the high-priest's entering into the most holy place on the day of atonement, and at no other time, and regards its inaccessibility to all others, and to him except on this one occasion, as significant of the imperfect acquaintance with the way of salvation which marked the whole period of that dispensation: ix. 1–10. He then traces the analogy in the fact of Christ having entered into the very highest heaven with the merits of an offering which made an eternal satisfaction. The benefits hence accruing he contrasts with the merely outward efficacy of the Jewish sacrifices, the death of Christ being the procuring cause whereby our eternal inheritance is secured: 11–15. In making a covenant, ordinary usage required that a victim should be slain, whose death ratified it, and in this way only was a covenant considered as firmly established. Until the ratifying victim was slain it remained invalid. Hence it is that the Mosaic covenant was instituted by the death of sacrificial victims; the prescribed circumstances connected with which are particularly stated in the law. And, in general, purification was effected by shedding the blood of the victim: 16–22. Inasmuch, then, as it was

necessary that the tabernacles should be ceremonially purified by means of such sacrifices, and thus made available for the purposes intended, heaven must also be made accessible by means of a sacrifice infinitely better, that which Christ himself hath brought for us into the very presence of God. His sacrifice, unlike those of the high-priest, needs no repetition. Once offered it avails for ever; and, therefore, the second glorious appearance of Christ is without a sin-offering, and in order to bestow salvation on all who religiously wait for him: 23–28.

The same subject is continued in the tenth chapter. The law is but an imperfect adumbration of Gospel blessings. Its constantly recurring sacrifices are ineffective. Were this not so, they would not be repeated, inasmuch as the relieved conscience would feel that no further sacrifice could be necessary; whereas we have the high-priest's atoning services annually reminding us that sin, our sin, is not thoroughly atoned for, that it still remains uncompensated, unforgiven. And no wonder, for how can any thinking man suppose that such a mere trifle as the slaughter of irrational animals could remove the penal consequences of sins by satisfying God's justice? And therefore, when Christ comes with his perfect atonement, he contrasts the weakness of the Jewish sacrifices with the efficiency of his own, doing away the former and permanently establishing the latter: x. 1–10. Every priest continues to offer his daily repeated yet inefficacious sacrifice; but he, after having offered his own permanently efficient oblation, triumphantly sits down on God's right hand, until all shall be subjected to him. His one oblation has done for ever all that was necessary. And this is corroborated to us by the language of the prophet. Entire remission implies perfect atonement and satisfaction: 11–18.

SECTION V.

Chap. X. 19–39.

THE OBLIGATION AND NECESSITY OF STEADFAST ADHERENCE TO THE GOSPEL INFERRED AND URGED.

This instruction is followed by practical exhortations. As the all-sufficient atonement of Christ has opened wide the entrance into heaven, and established the new and permanent method of ingress, and as our high-priest presides over God's family, let us, with the fullest confidence, approach the divine majesty, purified in the whole man, steadily professing the Gospel, mutually inciting to obedience, and uniting in Christian worship and exhortation, and the more earnestly as the time of trial draws near.

For wilful sinning and apostasy from the truth received can result in nothing but condemnation. The contemner of the law was subjected to merited punishment; much less can the apostate from the Gospel expect to escape: 19–31. Not willing to dwell on such a topic, the writer reminds his readers of their former devotion to Christianity notwithstanding their exposure to persecution, which they then bore faithfully. He urges them not to abandon their steadfastness, but patiently to continue doing the will of God until the coming of their deliverer, not drawing back to perdition, but abiding faithful so as to attain salvation: 32–39.

SECTION VI.

Chap. XI.

FAITH DEFINED AND EXEMPLIFIED.

The author now explains the meaning of faith, and then illustrates this divine grace by the character of the ancient worthies. His illustrations are evidently taken from the sacred books, beginning with Genesis. He refers to the account, received by faith, of the creation of the chaotic mass into a harmonious world fitted for the habitation of man—to the sacrifice of Abel, better than that of Cain, because offered in faith—to the translation of Enoch—to the conduct and character of Noah—to the faithful obedience of Abraham—to the faith of Sarah, who became the mother of the chosen race—to the benedictions given, under divine direction, by Isaac, to his two sons respectively—to the reliance on God and the devotion of the aged and infirm Jacob—to Joseph's confidence in the accomplishment of God's promise to bring the Israelites back again to Canaan, shown by his dying directions to transport thither his bones, which he well knew would be deposited in one of the most magnificent of Egyptian mausoleums—and to faith as prompting and governing the whole course of action of Moses, the great Hebrew lawgiver: 1–29. He passes on to subsequent facts and characters celebrated in the Old Testament, such as the fall of Jericho, the faith of Rahab, the conduct of Gideon and other judges of the Hebrew nation. He then refers, in general, to the course of religious action which distinguished the prophets and others of God's chosen people, men who suffered persecution, and lived and died in faith. Yet all, however honourably regarded, did not receive, during their earthly sojourn, the full accomplishment of God's promise in the coming of Christ and the blessings of his kingdom, these blessings being reserved for our time, so that they, apart from us, should not enjoy this perfect condition of spiritual benediction: 30–40.

SECTION VII.

CHAP. XII. XIII.

EXHORTATIONS TO PERSEVERANCE AND OTHER CHRISTIAN VIRTUES: CONCLUSION.

THE Apostle now exhorts to a Christian course in the presence of so vast and glorious an assemblage. He urges the Hebrew converts to look away from whatever might hinder or distract, to Jesus, the great leader, the patient and gloriously rewarded sufferer. They had not yet been called to sustain the severest persecutions, and they are reminded of the design and benefit of divine discipline, which, unlike human, is always intended to improve us, and has this effect when rightly received: xii. 1–11. He exhorts them to strengthen the weak, to cultivate peace and holiness, and to guard carefully against the introduction of wickedness; exhibiting the case of profane Esau as a warning. He contrasts the blessedness of their condition as Christians, connected with angels and the most glorious of heavenly beings, even God and the atoning Mediator, with the terrific character of the law, as indicated by the awful circumstances which marked its introduction. In doing this, he represents the grandeur and excellency of the Gospel, and thus illustrates the whole scope of the Epistle, under imagery which must have been particularly interesting to Hebrew converts. He beseeches them by a motive before mentioned, not to disregard the heavenly speaker; who had promised, after overturning earthly civil and religious establishments, to settle in everlasting stability the kingdom of the Messiah. Having become partakers, therefore, of such a kingdom, let us, says he, hold fast the Gospel with religious reverence, remembering that even our God is terrible in his judgments: 12–29.

The work is now brought to a close by some affectionate practical suggestions. The Hebrew converts are requested to remember and to imitate their spiritual guides. They are told that Christ is immutable, and are urged not to suffer themselves to be led away by novelties inconsistent with his truth. Obstinate and bigoted adherents to Jewish rites as the mode of acceptance with God in contradistinction to the Gospel, are excluded from the enjoyment and benefit of Christian privileges. In accordance with the usage prescribed by the law for the great day of atonement, Jesus suffered outside of the city. Carrying out the implied symbolical instruction, the author exhorts to follow him by abandoning Judaism at every hazard, and by seeking a permanent resting-place not here, but in heaven. Praise, good works, and obedience to spiritual rulers, with prayer,

and especially for the Apostle's restoration to those whom he is addressing, are then the topics of exhortation: xiii. 1–19. The Epistle concludes with an ascription of praise to God, the author of Christian blessings, which is framed in accordance with the leading doctrines therein contained; with a courteous entreaty of the writer to receive kindly what he had said; and with a notice of Timothy, and a general salutation: 20–24.

COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

SECTION I.

CHAP. I. II.

INTRODUCTION: CHRIST'S SUPERIORITY TO ANGELS.

I. Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς	God, who at sundry times and in I. divers manners spake in time past

CHAP. i. 1, 2.—The Greek word with which the author begins most probably comprehends both the diversity of times and of parts or degrees in which the ancient revelations were communicated, and that which immediately follows expresses the variety of methods which God employed to make his will known. The use of these adverbs, as well as their composition, authorizes us to give such distinct meanings to each. Hugo de Sancto Caro* enumerates fifteen different methods of conveying divine truth to men; but the distinction is not always discernible. In the fourth of my discourses on Prophecy,† the most usual and important are pointed out and illustrated.

As the antithesis evidently lies between partial and imperfect revelations by means of the prophets, and the full and complete communication made through the Son, I must retain the common meaning of ἐν υἱῷ, notwithstanding the attempt of Peile to support another. The absence of the article here, though employed in connection with the word *prophets*,

* The Commentary or Postillæ of Hugo on the whole Bible was published in six folio volumes at Basil, in 1504. The sixth part here referred to contains the Epistles of St. Paul, the Acts of the Apostles, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse.

† Thoughts on the Origin, Character and Interpretation of Scriptural Prophecy. 12mo. pp. 219. Harper and Brothers, New York.

unto the fathers by the prophets, | προφήταις, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τού-
2 Hath in these last days spoken unto | των ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ, ὃν ἔθηκε 2

seems to him to require a different translation, namely, "*as a Son*." He refers to Tit. iii. 5, Eph. i. 3 and ii. 22, as analogous texts, and to the first as "an unquestionable instance" of the dative of the intention, explaining it thus: "works *that should be for our righteousness*, *that should* justify, or form our ground of acceptance with God." But the more probable meaning is: '*works done in a supposed righteous condition*;' as this same Greek word is used in Phil. iii. 9, "not having my own righteousness," that is, '*such a state of supposed acceptableness* as attention to the law might produce.' Still less to the point are the other passages, which he would explain thus: "as *who should be heavenly ones*, his foreknown and predestined heirs in Christ;" and, "God revealed *as the Spirit*;" whereas they are properly translated, "*in heavenly places*," and, "*through the Spirit*." The sense which he desires to elicit would require εἰς, as in Rom. iv. 3, and Ps. cv. 31, Sept. This is the proper Hebrew idiom, which often occurs in the Old Testament, but it is quite different from the form of expression here.

The Apostle's language is by no means opposed to the view, that the being by means of whom God communicated his will to the patriarchs was the divine logos, his Son in the most distinguished sense, who, by assuming human nature, became the Saviour of the world. His antithesis lies between communications made through the prophets, and that made by the Son as the incarnate Messiah, who appeared in Palestine, proclaiming the kingdom of God, and authorizing his Apostles and their successors to perpetuate the proclamation.

"In these last days." In the original Greek, the word for *last* is in several ancient authorities in the plural number. This reading is followed in our translation just given. But the singular reading, which is found also in 2 Pet. iii. 3, is best supported by external authority. It implies an ellipsis of some word expressive of time, χρόνου or καιροῦ. See 1 Pet. i. 5, Jude 18. Then the following words will either be in apposition with it, or exegetical of it. In either case the result will be the same, thus: 'in the last period, (namely,) these days;' or, 'in the last period, (which is that) of these days.' The phrase *last* or *latter days* denotes either future time in general, or that of the Messiah who was to come. It is employed in the former sense in Gen. xlix. 2, Num. xxiv. 14, Deut. iv. 30, Dan. ii. 28; and in the latter in Isa. ii. 2, Mic. iv. 1, and frequently elsewhere, as here. It should be kept in mind that Messiah's *time* or *day* or *age* or *kingdom*, though often used in reference to its commencing point or original development, does sometimes comprehend a very extensive period, sometimes the whole duration of his kingdom, both in this world and in that which is to

κληρονόμον πάντων, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησε
3 τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης

us by *his* Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; Who being 3

---

come. And this unlimited meaning is the original and proper sense of the phrase, "the kingdom of God" or "of heaven."

"Heir:" This is equivalent to lord. The Hebrew first-born had peculiar privileges, and among them a double portion of the paternal estate. Deut. xxi. 17. He was therefore the most distinguished of the family, and honoured by the title of lord, which Jacob addressed to his brother Esau. See Gen. xxxii. 4, 18, xxxiii. 13, 14. First-born and heir and lord seem to be often equivalent. See Gal. iv. 1, where "the heir" is said to "be lord of all;" and compare Acts x. 36, ii. 36, and Ps. lxxxix. 27.

'By whom also he made the worlds;' or, 'by whom he made also,' or, 'he even made:' thus the copulative will qualify the verb, which is the more natural construction. As the Greek term translated "worlds," and the Hebrew to which it corresponds, are sometimes used in the sense of *ages* or *dispensations*, some have explained the clause thus: 'on account of whom he made or constituted the various dispensations:' that is, in establishing them God had the Messiah continually in view. But this is a very unusual sense of the preposition with the genitive, though common with the accusative, and is wholly unnecessary, whatever be the meaning attributed to the word translated worlds. The *agency* of the Son in making, not the circumstance of his being the object held in view by the maker, is the thought. The context requires the loftiest and fullest sense, that namely which is expressed in our English translation. In Isa. xi. 3, the same word is used to denote created objects. Peile, who admits this usage, not believing that the verb here employed would have been used if the writer had intended to convey the idea of creation, translates thus: "in whom he hath consummated the ages." It may be sufficient to remark, that while it is not to be denied that the verb *made* is often used in the sense of appointing, constituting, establishing, of which we have an instance in iii. 2, yet it is applied also to denote a proper creation. Thus we have it in Matt. xix. 4, "he that *made* them;" and in the Wisdom of Solomon ix. 1, "who hast *made* all things through thy word." Compare John i. 3, and Col. i. 16, 17, where creation is predicated of Christ, although the Greek words are different. The connection and scope determine the meaning; and here they are in favour of absolute creation, as appears from the next verse.

3. 'Who being the ray of his glory and the stamp of his substance and sustaining all things by his powerful word, after he had by himself purified us from sins by making an expiation, sat down at the right hand of the divine majesty in the highest heavens.'

Several particulars in this verse require attention. According to Dr.

the brightness of *his* glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word	*καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, δι' ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμὸν*

Peile, the Apostle proceeds now to declare "what God the Son is in himself, the light, namely, and the life of men; the one channel (as of return to so) of emanation from the father and fountain of all being; God in action, God in generation, God in love." What he means by the one channel of emanation I do not clearly understand. A channel is a means whereby something is conveyed, and possibly it may here denote that only medium whereby grace emanates and flows from the father. And yet the language, "return to" and "emanation from," being evidently antithetic, is hardly intelligible on such a supposition. But why introduce the clause of limitation *to us?* why restrict what the text makes general? Doubtless, the phrases comprehend what the Son has become to us, but they directly assert what he is in himself. They are intended to describe his ante-incarnate condition; though not without a reference, it may well be allowed, to his incarnate. Ἀπαύγασμα is employed in the Wisdom of Solomon vii. 25, to express divine wisdom. Visibility is not, therefore, necessarily implied in its meaning; and χαρακτὴρ, which denotes the impression made by the seal, expresses complete similarity. Still, there can be no objection to combine the two ideas of *most perfect resemblance visibly represented.* As the beam is intimately like the luminous body from which it emanates, and the stamp the very likeness and representation of the die that impresses it on the wax or other material; so is the Son, both originally in himself, and also in his incarnate condition, the very image of the Father, whose excellencies he most perfectly possesses and exhibits. Thus, as incarnate Messiah he displays to the universe those divine characteristics which are essentially and eternally his own. The inference which Pierce thinks is "clear from this text, that the being or substance of the Son must be distinct from that of the Father, since the one is the image of the other," results from the errour of carrying the comparison too far. It must not be extended beyond accurate likeness and visible exhibition.

The next clause, which represents the Son as the sustainer of all things, is in perfect accordance with the meaning of the last clause of the former verse, which affirms him to be the creator of the world. It corresponds with what is said in Col. i. 17, "by him all things subsist."

I have endeavoured to express the meaning of καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, by a paraphrase. Similar language occurs in Job vii. 21 in the Septuagint: 'why hast thou not made an expiation (lit. purification) of my sin?' ἐποιήσω καθαρισμὸν τῆς ἀνομίας μου?—"Majesty" is a metonomy, or the abstract for the concrete, for the most majestic one, God. The expression "by himself" must not be overlooked. It seems to inti-

ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς,

of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on

---

mate that Christ's atoning action is, in one most important respect, peculiar. He offers the sacrifice which he is at the same time himself. Unlike every other case, the victim and the priest are identical. Comp. vii. 27, ix. 12, 14, 25, 26, x. 10, xiii. 12, where this peculiarity is set in contradistinction to the ordinary Jewish usage.

4. The superiority of Christ to angels is here stated to consist, in his being dignified as rightful heir with the elevated title of Son. He has a claim to this appellation in the very highest sense, and his superiority lies in this point, not in the bare title of *son* which is sometimes given to angels and even men, but in such sonship as his nature, character and station allow him to claim. In order rightly to appreciate the argument that follows, it is necessary to view it in this light. The aorist γενόμενος, *having been made* or *become*, is antithetic to the present ὤν, *being*, in ver. 3.—Comp. in reference to elevation here implied, Eph. i. 21, Phil. ii. 9.

5. See Ps. ii. 7, and 2 Sam. vii. 14. The force of the argument from these quotations depends on their implying the sense of the word *son* as just stated, and on their applicability to the Messiah as exalted in his human nature to the highest created distinction. It becomes necessary, therefore, to examine these quotations with some particularity. As there is some difficulty arising out of the application of certain texts of the Old Testament, which are cited in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and especially in the first two chapters, I think it best here, in the outset, to bring the general subject of quotations before the reader. It is one of very great importance, and ought to command particular attention.

In the Hebrews the quotations from the Old Testament usually agree very nearly with the Greek of the Septuagint, and this is often the case in other books of the New Testament. But in several places they correspond exactly with the Hebrew, as in Matt. ix. 13, "mercy *and not* sacrifice," where the Septuagint reads "*rather than*" and is therefore exegetical; and in several they differ slightly from both. Sometimes they appear to have been made from memory, and the New Testament writer has his mind directed rather to the thought than the words. Occasionally two or more places of the Old Testament are combined. Instances of this last class may be found in Rom. iii. 10–18, compared with Ps. xiv. 1–3, v. 9, x. 7, Isa. lix. 7, 8, Prov. i. 16, Ps. xxxvi. 1, and in Rom. xi. 26, 27 compared with Isa. lix. 20, 21, xxvii. 9, and in the Septuagint, Ps. xiii. 7. On points of this kind, however, it is not my intention to enlarge. I propose to examine the various ways in which passages from the Old Testament are found to be employed as quotations in the New.

4	high; Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent	τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα. Τίνι γὰρ εἶπέ ποτε	4 5

It has been maintained that the application of a quoted text is necessarily in accordance with its original meaning, provided it be introduced with the formula, *that* or *in order that* the declaration intended by the original passage *might be fulfilled*; but that if the formula be, *then was fulfilled*, a wider latitude of application is allowable. But this rule is not well supported. No inference can be drawn from the form of expression by which a quotation is preceded. The word *to fulfil* may be employed where accomplishment, properly speaking, cannot be maintained without doing violence to the original connection or meaning of the passage quoted. The phrases *that*, *in order that*, do not always denote the *end* and *design* of the declaration quoted, but frequently express nothing more than an allowable application of it to the topic in connection with which it is used in the New Testament. On this point it may be sufficient to refer to Robinson's Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament under ἵνα, introductory remarks to I. and II., and concluding note to the latter; and under ὅπως II.

The applicability of many quotations to the particular topic intended by the New Testament writers has been a fruitful subject of discussion. Some may say that the inspiration of those writers ought to determine the question and settle it on the ground of their divine authority; that the connection in which a text may stand in the New Testament must of itself show its true and only meaning. But this assumes more than can be admitted; and, moreover, we ought to be prepared to meet the objection of the infidel, as well as to appeal to the faith of the believer. Besides, a candid man will feel that there are difficulties which cannot be solved by any exercise of implicit faith, however sincere and thorough. Many cases occur where the connection in the Old Testament is so plain as to prove that the meaning in which the quoted words seem to be taken in the New cannot possibly be that originally intended. In such circumstances an appeal to the inspiration of the writers merely cuts the knot—silencing without convincing the believer.

Neither, on the other hand, is it satisfactory to say of all such cases, that the Old Testament passages are cited simply by way of accommodation, merely because of some degree of similarity or adaptation in the point or topic evolved in the New Testament with that declared by the text cited from the Old. For many quotations occur in such a logical dependence on the author's train of remarks or reasoning, that to attribute the use of them to such a principle, is to make them unmeaning. It is really equivalent to a denial of the New Testament author's right knowledge of the signification of which he quotes; and this is a result admitted by the

neological or naturalistic expositor. The Christian writers, it is coolly said, mistook the meaning of the Hebrew. If their divine authority be admitted, this conclusion must of course be rejected as false; and should that authority be even denied, their character as careful authors and accurate thinkers, often conducting in detail a lengthened argument with logical precision, sufficiently confutes such a superficial theory.

The correct interpreter, whose expositions must always be based on true philosophical and Christian principles, which are ever identical, can admit no accommodation of sentiment in matters directly religious or which have a direct bearing on religion. It is true that, in a very few instances, there will be even among conscientious expositors a difference of opinion respecting the application of the principle. But this by no means affects the principle itself. It only shows that in some cases it is difficult to apply it, and leaves such to the varying judgments of honest and devout minds.*

The only course to be adopted in order to arrive at a satisfactory result is, to examine every important quotation, reducing it to some definite class, and hence to construct certain principles, one or other of which, without affecting the inspiration of any part of the Bible, may apply to the various quotations that are to be found in the entire New Testament, without putting any forced construction on their evident meaning, or respective contents, in either portion of the sacred volume.

I submit to the attentive reader's consideration the following as the result of such an attempt. It is, perhaps, unnecessary, and yet it may not be inexpedient to say, that a hasty glance at the principles or rules laid down must be useless. In order to form a right judgment, they ought to be carefully compared with their respective texts, and these as carefully examined along with their contexts.

(1.) Quotations are frequently made in order to express a literal fulfilment of what is announced thereby in the Old Testament, the subject respecting which they are used in the New being identically the same as that of the Old.

The illustration of this principle need not be extended beyond a single instance, as it is too well known not to be universally conceded. The quotation in Matt. ii. 6, which is the second in the New Testament, is unquestionably one of this sort. The subject both of the Prophet and the Evangelist is the same, namely, the birth-place of the Messiah, which was predicted to be Bethlehem, where, by the remarkable influence of divine Providence, Christ was born. The slight verbal discrepancies, which are easily removed, do not at all affect the direct application.

(2.) We often meet with quotations where no fulfilment, properly speaking, is intended by the New Testament writer. He merely accommodates

* For a further development of the subject of accommodation, I refer the reader to Note xli. in my translation of Planck's Introduction to Sacred Criticism and Interpretation, pp. 277–284.

the language of the Old to the subject of which he is speaking; either on account of its appropriateness thereto, or because the two facts, although entirely separate and distinct, have nevertheless some points of similarity. Thus St. Matthew applies to the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem, the lamentation which Jeremiah poetically ascribes to Rachel on account of the misery which she is represented as enduring at the sight of her unhappy children not long before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. Comp. Matt. ii. 18, with Jer. xxxi. 15. In the same way might the prophet's notice of any similar event be employed. To infer from the application of his words, that the dastardly and savage act of Herod was in the view of the divine seer and intended exclusively or directly of him, is a gratuitous assumption for which there is not a particle of evidence.—Thus also the language in Ps. lxxviii. 2, is accommodated in Matt. xiii. 35. The Psalmist proposes to bring before his readers some things which to them were obscure and in a measure unknown, and are therefore spoken of as parables, things hidden from time immemorial. An examination of the Psalm shows conclusively that the author expresses his intention to urge upon his readers gratitude and obedience to God by bringing clearly before their minds some of the many mercies which he had formerly granted them, and which they either had forgotten or failed rightly to consider. "I will open my mouth in a parable; I will utter dark sayings of old; which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us." But the evangelist applies the former portion of these words to our Lord's use of parabolical instruction, and even employs the formula which, it has been said, is never used except when a direct accomplishment is intended: "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables," &c. And yet it is evident that nothing beyond a mere accommodation of the language can possibly be meant.—Most probably, too, the 4th verse of the 19th Psalm, as quoted in Rom. x. 18, "Their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world," is accommodated by St. Paul to the wide dissemination of the Gospel. The Psalmist is speaking of God's nature and glory as made known to the universe by the works of creation, and especially by means of the heavenly bodies, which he beautifully represents as sounding forth the praises of their maker. To ascribe to the words a meaning beyond this plain and ostensible one, which alone is in harmony with the immediate context, and thus to make them comprehend that in which the Apostle uses them, is wholly unauthorized and without any solid support. Quotations of this class are also very numerous.

(3.) Sometimes quotations are made when the intention is to express a fulfilment in addition to the literal sense; or when the original passage comprehends the subject which the quotation in the New Testament presents, and is therefore susceptible of increasing accomplishment.

This is a very important principle, and cases requiring its application are of frequent occurrence. In order that its meaning may be clearly perceived and its bearing properly appreciated, let the following passages be carefully considered.

The first part of the principle applies to the whole subject of typical accomplishment. If David were a type of Christ, as no one denies who admits the typical element at all, language originally intended of him and his immediate enemies may also be intended of Christ and his enemies. The latter point is comprehended within the language quoted, although it may not be its literal or most ostensible meaning. Thus, in Ps. cxviii. 22, "the stone which the builders refused," denotes David as at first rejected and opposed by the Israelitish faction, which for more than six years adhered to the house of Saul; and yet it is no less certainly intended of David's antitype, and therefore is thus applied by our Lord himself and his distinguished Apostle. See Matt. xxi. 42, Acts iv. 11. On the same principle is to be explained the application to Judas of what is originally meant of Ahithophel. Comp. Acts i. 20 with Ps. lxix. 26, cix. 8, 2 Sam. xvii. 23. And, as the paschal lamb was typical of the atoning Saviour, the direction in Exodus that "a bone thereof should not be broken," finds its ultimate and complete accomplishment in the fact of our Lord's limbs being uninjured by the soldiers which is mentioned by St. John. See Exod. xii. 46, and John xix. 36. And the language of Ps. xci. 11, "He shall give his angels charge over thee, and they shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone," is rightly regarded as intended of Christ, because of its comprehensive character. The Psalmist is describing God's providential and, if necessary, even miraculous care of his true servants, shown in protecting them from injury, and his language is especially appropriate to the truest and most beloved of all his servants, the favoured Messiah. The quotation, though put in the mouth of the tempter, is in harmony with very many others, and is not to be regarded as a mere accommodation.

There is also another and very numerous class of quotations, the applicability of which cannot be satisfactorily explained on any other principle.

One of the most prominent of this class is the language in Isa. xl. 3, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord," &c., which is applied by each of the evangelists to the public proclamation of John the Baptist. The prophecy predicts the call and return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, and together with this the call and return of mankind to God by means of the Gospel of Christ. Neither of these topics can be excluded from the full sense of the comprehensive prediction, while the latter is that in which the prophet's language is quoted by all the evangelists, and also by St. Peter, i. 25. In further illustration

of this quotation, I would refer the reader to the fifth of my discourses on Prophecy, pp. 86 et seq., where he will find also the principle under consideration applied to Deut. xviii. 18, and 2 Sam. vii. 14, compared with Acts iii. 22, 23, and Heb. i. 5.—The divine promise to Abraham, "A father of many nations have I made thee," in Gen. xvii. 5, predicts the numerous progeny that should descend from him, and establish themselves as separate nations in various parts of the world. But this does not preclude the wider import of the words taught us by the Apostle, who applies this prediction to the fact of Abraham's being the spiritual father of all the faithful, Gentiles as well as Jews: Rom. iv. 16–18.—And when Isaiah predicts that, notwithstanding the various hostile attacks by which the people should be distressed and slaughtered, the excision should not be total—"a remnant shall return;" his language comprises also the spiritual return to God of Jews converted to the Gospel, as St. Paul applies it. With Rom. ix. 27, comp. Isa. x. 20–22, vi. 13.—It would be easy to multiply illustrations of this principle, but those adduced are perhaps sufficient to establish and place it in a clear light.

(4.) But there is still another method of quoting from the Old Testament which is employed by writers of the New much oftener than is generally supposed. Frequently they simply express their own thoughts in the language quoted. By consequence, the original meaning of the quotation has no necessary connection with that which they may have intended.

Before proceeding to illustrate and defend this principle, it may be proper to remark, that the apostles and evangelists might naturally be expected to quote frequently and largely from the Old Testament. It could not well be otherwise. The Gospel system, contained in their writings, is a religion emanating from the same holy being who promulged that which is spread over the pages of the ancient inspired historians, poets, and prophets. As both originated from the same divine source, the documents which embody the older would most naturally be appealed to by those who were the chosen instruments to put on record the latter. It were preposterous to imagine that they could have been neglected or overlooked. And this is confirmed by the consideration, that the systems not only proceed from the same source, but that the one is a full disclosure of the spiritual intent and ultimate object of the other. Christianity is but the divine and glorious temple, of which the former dispensation was the dimly lighted indeed yet most imposing vestibule. Christ is the end of the law, the great object to which its ceremonies, institutions, and official personages all had reference. In explaining therefore the system of religion which discloses the grand design of that which preceded and introduced it, and therefore proves the harmony of each with the other, and in a certain sense the unity of both, the sacred writers of the New Testament would of course refer to, draw from, apply, and expound numerous passages

in the Old. The fulfilment of prophecy, both as respects the person and character of our Lord, and also the faith which he established, must necessarily require the same procedure.

In addition to all this it should be considered, that the Apostles were not in general men of literature, or even of much education, and consequently that their reading previously to their conversion had been principally confined to the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Indeed, in their age, these sacred books constituted the greater part of the limited circle of Jewish literature, to which, of course, the general reading must have been chiefly directed. And it should be particularly noted, that the more pious portion of the Hebrew community were doubtless in the habit of reading the Bible, and more especially in proportion as their interest in the approaching kingdom of God became the more earnest. Like devout men in all ages, their religious perceptions and emotions found something correspondent in sacred scripture, and repeated perusal of the holy volume filled their minds with its sentiments and their memories with its language. It was natural therefore that they should habitually cite this language, and clothe their own thoughts with its sacred drapery. The very words of the Old Testament would naturally and even unconsciously occur to them, as the fittest vehicle to express the sentiment intended.

I proceed now to cite a few texts in confirmation of this last principle.

We have two very striking instances of this method of quoting in the tenth chapter of Romans, the former of which occurs also in Gal. iii. 12. The Apostle is speaking of justification through Christ by faith, in contradistinction to the vain effort of the Jews to be justified by the law. After stating that the law pointed to Christ as its end and object, he remarks that when Moses says, "the man that doeth these things shall live by them," he "describeth the justification which is of the law:" ver. 5. Does the Apostle mean to explain these words according to their signification in Levit. xviii. 5, where they are to be found? This cannot be. It is evident that the lawgiver is about to lay down precepts for the guidance of every Hebrew, commands which every one is required to obey, and which constitute a very important part of the Jewish code. But such a view of the words quoted does not harmonize with the application made of them by St. Paul; and it cannot with any show of reason be assumed that Moses has a deeper meaning than the ostensible one, and thus employs them in the sense of the Apostle. He evidently expresses his own thoughts in the words quoted, employing them to mark the characteristic features of law, which are active obedience. It is as if he had said, the language of Moses suitably expresses the only condition of being justified by law, namely, perfect obedience to its demands. And the same principle applies to the clauses in the next verses quoted from Deut. xxx. 12 et seq. Their author assures the Israelites that God's command is not something very

difficult to be attained and impossible to be done; on the contrary, it is quite intelligible, within reach of the most ordinary understanding, and comparatively easy of performance. But what Moses says of the law which he had been the agent in promulging, St. Paul says of faith, which throughout the epistle he makes prominent as the only means of justification.

Occasionally the citation entirely escapes the English reader, because it is not taken from the Hebrew of which our Old Testament is a translation, but from the Septuagint, which is different. Thus the Apostle's exhortation in Eph. iv. 26, "Be ye angry and sin not," is in the very words of that ancient Greek version of Ps. iv. 5, where more accurately our translation has, "Stand in awe and sin not." And in Heb. x. 5, "A body hast thou prepared me," is from the same version of Ps. xxxix. (xl.) 6, where the Hebrew has, "Mine ears hast thou opened." But in neither case does the quotation compel us to regard this as the true meaning of the original, as in the latter its force lies in the whole passage and not merely in this particular clause, and in the former the Greek words are merely used to embody the Apostle's exhortation.

I shall adduce but one instance more to illustrate this principle. It is impossible to read the two clauses of Prov. x. 12, without perceiving that the antithesis lies between that detestable temper which, with malignant pleasure, busies itself in promoting discord, and that godlike disposition of love which kindly conceals the faults of another. And in this sense the latter of the two is quoted in 1 Peter iv. 8. But St. James concludes his epistle with the same clause, and the connection in which it occurs requires another sense, namely, that of becoming the occasion of a penitent brother's pardon. "He that converteth a sinner from the errour of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall *hide a multitude of sins*."* Did the Apostle understand this to be the meaning of Solomon? There is no evidence that he did, neither is it in the least degree probable. We have only to allow that he expresses his own thought in the appropriate words of the wise king, and all difficulty is removed.

I have already said that quotations in this and other ways might be expected from such writers as those of the New Testament. And it would be easy to produce analogous citations from authors of an early age, and especially Jewish. I will add, however, but one illustration, taken from an ancient ecclesiastical history, some portions of which have been preserved by Eusebius. He quotes Hegesippus, whose work is unfortunately lost,

* I am aware that another meaning has been given to this text, but I think it very unwarrantable. Thus Dr. Hammond explains it of "love covering over the sins of him who cherishes and practises it." This is quite explicable, and the sentiment might be defended; but it is not a natural exposition nor in accordance with usage. The New Testament never speaks of sins being covered, that is, pardoned, in this way. Pott, on James v. 20, quotes from Joma, fol. 87, 1, "Whoever brings many to righteousness, by his means sin is not committed."

who, in narrating the stoning of James the Just by the Jews, says that thereby "they *fulfilled* the Scripture written by Isaiah," quoting iii. 10, as it is in the Septuagint with the alteration of one word: "Let us take away (*bind* in the Sept.) the just man, for he is offensive to us." Eus. Hist. Eccles. Lib. II. Cap. 23. The word for *fulfilled* in the history is the same as that constantly used by the New Testament writers. Yet it is not to be supposed that either Hegesippus or Eusebius imagined that Isaiah prophesied of the murder of James. They undoubtedly accommodated the text to the fact. And, in all probability, this affords the true solution of numerous supposed interpretations in the works of the fathers; as for example, the application by many of the language, "Give us this day our daily bread," to the eucharist;* and that of the 45th Psalm, "My heart is bursting out with a good matter," (Gr. *Logos*,) to the doctrine of the generation of the Son.†

On the formulæ employed by the Rabbies in citing the Old Testament, many of which occur in the New, and on the application of quotations, I would refer the reader to the Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς of Surenhusius; also to Tholuck on John ii. 16, 17, who shows that the Rabbinic and Syriac writers, and also the Koran, abound with accommodated quotations.

With the view of aiding the careful reader of the New Testament in his examination of this subject, I subjoin a table of those quotations which may be thought to involve any difficulty, assigning them respectively to the class to which they seem most probably to belong. The chapters and verses in the Old Testament are given according to the English translation.

Matt. i. 23.	Isa. vii. 14.	1.
ii. 6.	Mic. v. 2.	1.
" 15.	Hos. xi. 1.	3.
" 18.	Jer. xxxi. 15.	2.
iii. 3.	Isa. xl. 3.	3.
iv. 6.	Ps. xci. 11, 12.	3.
" 15, 16.	Isa. ix. 1, 2.	1.
viii. 17.	liii. 4	3.
xi. 10.	Mal. iii. 1.	1.
xii. 18–21.	Isa. xlii. 1–4.	1.
xiii. 14, 15.	vi. 9, 10.	2.
" 35.	Ps. lxxviii. 2.	2.
xv. 8, 9.	Isa. xxix. 13.	2.
xxi. 5.	Zech. ix. 9.	1.
" 13.	{ Isa. lvi. 7. Jer. vii. 11. }	1.
" 42.	Ps. cxviii. 22, 23.	3.
xxii. 44.	cx. i.	1.
xxvi. 31.	Zech. xiii. 7.	1.
xxvii. 9, 10.	xi. 13.	1.
" 35.	Ps. xxii. 18.	1.
Mark i. 2, 3.	{ Mal. iii. 1. Isa. xl. 3. }	1.
xv. 28.	Isa. liii. 12.	1.

Luke i. 17.	Mal. iv. 6.	1.
iv. 18, 19.	Isa. lxi. 1, 2.	1.
xxiii. 46.	Ps. xxxi. 5.	2.
John ii. 17.	lxix. 9.	3.
vi. 31.	{ Ps. lxxviii. 24.; Exod. xvi. 4. }	1.
xii. 38.	Isa. liii. 1.	1.
xiii. 18.	Ps. xli. 9.	2.
xv. 25.	{ Ps. xxxv. 19, or cix. 3. }	2 or 3.
xix. 36.	Exod. xii. 46.	3.
" 37.	Zech. xii. 10.	1.
Acts i. 20.	{ Ps. lxix. 25, cix. 8. }	3.
ii. 17–21.	Joel ii. 28–32.	1.
" 25–28.	Ps. xvi. 8–11.	1.
iii. 22, 23.	{ Deut. xviii. 15, 18, 19. }	3.
" 25.	Gen. xxii. 18.	1.
iv. 25, 26.	Ps. ii. 1, 2.	1.
viii. 32, 33.	Isa. liii. 7, 8.	1.
xiii. 33.	Ps. ii. 7.	1.
" 34.	Isa. lv. 3.	1.

* See my Essay on our Lord's discourse at Capernaum, pp. 118, 119.

† This is done by TERTULLIAN. See Adv. Hermog., cap. 18; Adv. Marc., lib. ii. cap. 4. iv. 14; Adv. Prax., cap. 7, 11, pp. 289, 383, 425, 503, 505. Edit. Rigalt, Paris. 1675. CYPRIAN also applies the verse in the same way: Adv. Judæos., lib. ii. cap. 3, p. 32. Edit. Oxon. 1682.

Acts xiii. 35.	Ps. xvi. 10.	1.
" 41.	Hab. i. 5.	2.
" 47.	Isa. xlix. 6.	1.
xv. 16, 17.	Amos ix. 11, 12.	1.
Rom. i. 17.	Hab. ii. 4.	3.
ii. 24.	Isa. lii. 5.	2.
iii. 10–18.	Ps. xiv. 1–3: v. 9; cxl. 3; x. 7; Isa. lix. 7, 8; Prov. i. 16; Psalm xxxvi. i.	1.
iv. 17.	Gen. xvii. 5.	3.
viii. 33, 34.	Isa. xlix. 8, 9.	2.
" 36.	Ps. xliv. 22.	2.
ix. 25, 26.	Hos. ii. 23, with ii. 1 and i. 9, 6.	1 & 3.
" 27.	Isa. x. 22.	3.
" 29.	i. 9.	2.
" 33.	Isa. viii. 14; xxvii. 16.	1.
x. 5.	Levit. xviii. 5.	4.
" 6–8.	Deut. xxx. 12–14.	4.
" 15.	Isa. lii. 7.	3.
" 18.	Ps. xix. 4.	2.
" 19.	Deut. xxxii. 21.	3.
" 20, 21.	Isa. lxv. 1, 2.	1.
xi. 8.	xxix. 10.	2.
1 Cor. ix. 9.	Deut. xxv. 4.	2.
xiv. 21.	Isa. xxviii. 11, 12.	2.
xv. 25.	Ps. cx. 1.	1.
" 27.	Ps. viii. 6.	3.
" 54.	Isa. xxv. 8.	3.
2 Cor. ii. 9.	lxiv. 4.	3.
2 Cor. iv. 13.	Ps. cxvi. 10.	2.
vi. 2.	Isa. xlix. 8.	3.
" 17, 18.	lii. 11, 12.	2.
viii. 15.	Exod. xvi. 18.	2.
Gal. iii. 10.	Deut. xxvii. 26.	2.
iv. 27.	Isa. liv. 1.	1.
" 30.	Gen. xxi. 10.	3.
Eph. iv. 8.	Ps. lxviii. 18.	3.
" 26.	iv. 5. (Sept.)	4.
1 Tim. v. 18.	Deut. xxv. 4.	2.
2 " ii. 19.	Num. xvi. 5.	2.
Heb. i. 5.	Ps. ii. 7; 2 Sam. vii. 14.	1 & 3.
" 6.	Ps. xcvii. 7, or Deut. xxxii. 43. (S.)	3.
" 7.	Ps. civ. 4.	1.
" 8, 9.	xlv. 6, 7.	1.
" 10–12.	cii. 25–27.	1.
ii. 6–8	viii. 4–6.	3.
" 12.	xxii. 22.	3.
" 13.	Isa. viii. 17, 18.	3.
iv. 3.	Ps. xcv. 11.	3.
v. 6.	" cx. 4.	1.
viii. 8–12.	Jer. xxxi. 31–34.	1.
x. 5–7.	Ps. xl. 6–8.	1 or 4.
" 16, 17.	Jer. xxxi. 33, 34.	1.
James v. 20.	Prov. x. 12.	4.
1 Pet. i. 24, 25.	Isa. xl. 7, 8.	3.
ii. 6.	xxviii. 16.	1.
" 9.	Exod. xix. 6.	2.
iii. 14, 15.	Isa. viii. 12, 13.	2.
iv. 8.	Prov. x. 12.	1.
" 18.	Prov. xi. 31.	2.
Rev. ii. 27.	Ps. ii. 9.	1.

Many other texts might have been cited, but it is supposed that these are sufficient to sustain the principles before stated, and to illustrate their application. I proceed now to remark on the 5th verse.

The second Psalm most certainly celebrates the exaltation of the Messiah, who is probably its only subject. If it have relation to David at all, this must be very vague and imperfect. It is worthy of note that this is the oldest Jewish interpretation, as is acknowledged by Jarchi, who frankly avows in his commentary as first published, that the interpretation which explains it of David, originated in a wish to refute the heretics, meaning the Christians. In Acts iv. 25–28, the Psalm is applied by the Apostles to Christ; and in xiii. 33, St. Paul cites the very words here quoted, and explains them of Christ's resurrection. This is doubtless the fact which they affirm, the resurrection of our Lord being the commencing point of his glorification. The verb may be declarative, (as is πεπαλαίωκε in Heb. viii. 13,) meaning, that God by raising him from the dead publicly proclaimed the Messiah to be his "honourable Son," in the language of St. Paul, "the Son of God in power:" Rom. i. 4. Or it may be employed by a figure, the resurrection being regarded as a second birth. In the New Testament regeneration or new birth, and resurrection both moral and material, are sometimes introduced in connection, as are also resurrection and sonship. Comp. Matt. xix. 28, Luke xx. 36, Rom. viii. 23, vi. 4, 8.

τῶν ἀγγέλων· υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε; καὶ πάλιν· ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται 6 μοι εἰς υἱόν; Ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ

name than they. For unto which 5 of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be

---

The resurrection of Christ which the Psalm expresses implies, of course, the resurrection and glorification of all his true followers, and hence the propriety of such language as that in Eph. ii. 5, 6, and elsewhere. But this by no means warrants the extraordinary representation of Peile, that "the Christ with reference to whom the promise and decree (in the Psalm) was spoken" comprehends the collective body of true Christians. His paraphrastic translation of σήμερον by "from this day forward," is wholly unsupported.*

The next quotation is taken from 2 Sam. vii. 14. The εἰς is Hebraistic, equivalent to לְ. Efforts have been made to explain this passage exclusively either of Solomon or of Christ; but in vain. The context will not allow such a limitation. The "seed" predicted is a royal progeny, not merely an individual son, but a succession of kings; and as the Messiah is the most distinguished and glorious, whatever of dignity and honour is asserted or implied in the context is properly attributable to him. The establishment of his kingdom, the building of his spiritual temple, the absolute authority and perpetuity of his dominion, his everlasting enjoyment of the divine favour, in a word, whatever greatness properly appertains to the glorified Messiah, is therefore comprehended within this prediction. Portions of it indeed are applicable to Solomon, and were no doubt intended of him as forming one link of the golden chain of regal dignities; but the true meaning of the prophecy requires a more general application, and in its fullest sense it is accomplished only in Christ. It must be borne in mind that the quotation is imperfect, the author both here and elsewhere presuming his reader to be well acquainted with the context. The subject in 2 Sam. is the same as that recorded in the parallel history, 1 Chron. xvii., and of which David speaks to his son in 1 Chron. xxii. 7 et seq. Attempts have been made to prove that the last portion relates to a

* In order to show that the opinion before expressed of this work is not without reason, I here subjoin an extract. "It was, then, with prospective reference (Gal. iii. 17) unto THE CHRIST—the one New and Spiritual Man which collectively *we* are, as through one Spiritual consecration of our natural manhood brought by Baptism into One Representative Body, and as collectively present before God (1) in the grace of our Election from all Eternity to stand unto him in the relation of SONS *in Jesus Christ*, Eph. i. 4, 5; (2) in the truth of that glorified Human Nature wherein the God-Man, *our* Representative and Advocate with the Father, is our most mighty Saviour and Deliverer; seeing that *He ever liveth* to make intercession for THE CHURCH, which is His Body (ch. vii. 8, 25, 1 Thess. i. 10, John xiv. 19)—that the Eternal Promise and Decree was spoken: THOU ART MY SON; FROM THIS DAY FORWARD, unborn as thou yet art in the womb of Time, I STAND TO THEE IN THE RELATION OF FATHER, AND THOU TO ME IN THE RELATION OF SON. Under *this* view," &c. It is probable that one such specimen will satisfy the reader.

6 to me a Son? And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten

τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, λέγει· καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες

---

prophecy "entirely distinct" from that narrated in the two former. See Peirce's note (n) on the text in Hebrews. None of his arguments will bear examination, and his translation of the Hebrew words in 2 Sam. vii. 14, is so forced that the merest tyro in the language must see at once that it cannot be defended. That given by Dr. Hales* is even more objectionable. Our English version needs no alteration. The reader may find the views of both these authors in Note xviii., appended to the fifth discourse on Prophecy, that namely on Prophetic Vision, where the subject of this prediction is more particularly stated.

6. The first words may be rendered, 'when he again bringeth in,' referring to Christ's second coming into the world at his resurrection. This is sanctioned by the Vulgate, cum iterum introducit. Or the adverb may be regarded merely as introducing another proof, as in our English translation. Or it may mean, 'on the other hand, when he bringeth in;' thus implying that what immediately follows shows the infinite inferiority of angels to the divine Messiah. The word πρωτότοκον, "first-begotten," is equivalent to heir or lord, as was remarked on ver. 2.

The quotation that follows is found with verbal accuracy in Deut. xxxii. 43, in the Septuagint, but in no other ancient version, nor in the original. A text very similar occurs in Ps. xcvii. 7, in the Hebrew and all the versions. It is somewhat uncertain which of the two passages is the one here quoted.

Tholuck is confident that the words are taken from Deuteronomy, but supposes that the author has his mind on the thought suggested in the Psalm. If the quotation be made from the Song of Moses, the connection in which it stands there would accord with its application in the Epistle. In Rom. x. 19, xi. 11, 14, the apostle applies what is said in this same poem, ver. 21, to the conversion of Gentiles exciting the Jews to emulation of their Gospel blessings, showing that the language of Moses had an ultimate reference to the times of the Messiah, who consequently might be introduced in the same connection. But the difficulty of such a view is, that the proof depends entirely on one ancient version. We must therefore either say, that the words have been lost from the original Hebrew and preserved by that version alone; or else, that the author, writing principally for those who admitted that version, appeals to it as authority to them, thus employing the argumentum ad hominem; or finally, that he employs the words of the Septuagint in order to express his own statement. The first theory assumes what cannot be allowed; the last is inadmissible, for the words quoted are evidently intended as proof. The other

* Analysis of Chronology, vol. ii. p. 367, London, 4to, 3 vols. 1811.

7 ἄγγελοι θεοῦ. Καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέ- | into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.

---

ought never to be employed, except in cases too clear to admit of doubt, as for example, Matt. xii. 27, and xxix. 17. Let us therefore attend to the language of the Psalm.

Here the words in the Septuagint agree with those quoted, except in the form of the verb. But the difficulty lies in the meaning, which seems to be altogether different from that which the quotation is introduced to sustain. Our English translation gives the true sense of the clause: "Worship him, all ye gods." The whole Psalm evidently describes the universality of the reign of Jehovah, before whom idolatry is to fall, and whose sole divinity all pretended objects of worship are to recognise. There is no difficulty in allowing a direct application to Messiah's kingdom, which is identical with that of Jehovah. The difficulty lies in perceiving how the words, "worship him, all ye gods," immediately subsequent to these, "confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols," can be understood in any other sense than that just stated. Whereas they are in the epistle applied to prove, that the high and holy angels themselves are required to pay divine adoration to the Messiah. No other view can satisfy a candid inquirer than that which admits the quotation to be made in the way of argument.

The Hebrew uses the word *god* or *gods;* the Septuagint employs *angels*, as it does also in some other places, and this is adopted by the author. To make the subject as clear as possible it may be well to remark, that the Hebrew term which denotes God, whether true or false, is used also figuratively for God's representatives on earth, magistrates and rightful authorities. But it is especially important to be here considered, that it is employed also to denote angels. It may be sufficient to adduce one striking passage from Ps. viii. 5, "Thou hast made him a little lower than *the angels;*" literally, than *God* or *gods*. But such a literal translation is entirely out of the question, and there can be no reasonable doubt that *angels* is the true meaning. Hengstenberg* denies it in words, but he virtually admits it by allowing that while "Elohim expresses the abstract idea of Godhead, where it is not made concrete by the article, it is not rarely used where something merely super-earthly is designed to be marked;" referring to Zech. xii. 8. If it be inquired, why is the term *God* used for *angels*, the answer may be, that this is merely another instance of the figure which applies it to God's representatives or agents. It may also be, that as angelic beings are in most intimate union with God, and in the enjoyment of his immediate presence in heaven, the same term

* Commentary on the Psalms, English Translation, by Fairbairn and Thomson, Edin. 1846, vol. i. p. 134.

7 And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his

λους λέγει· ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐ-

---

by which he is himself denominated may also be applied to them, though of course in an infinitely inferior sense. The phrase *divine ones* would express both the meaning and the reason. If now this be adopted as the translation of the words in the 97th Psalm, we shall get a broad sense, comprehending that to sustain which they are quoted, and that also which the original context requires: 'Worship him all ye divine ones.' We have only to understand the phrase of those who really are in some sense divine, and those who are falsely supposed to be so, in order to relieve both the text of the Psalm and its application in the Epistle of all embarrassment. The whole thought expressed in the clause will then be: 'Recognise his truly divine authority, ye holy angels, and ye also whom ignorant men have falsely represented as being yourselves entitled to divine honours.'

It may be worthy of note that the Syriac and Vulgate translations of the Psalm agree with the Septuagint in the use of *angels*.*

7. For *spirits* in our English translation we ought to substitute *winds*, which is a very common meaning of the original, both in Hebrew and Greek. The quotation is from Ps. civ. 4. The meaning in the epistle is evident: God's angels and ministering spirits, although great and glorious beings, are employed by him in the same way as the more ordinary agents of nature, winds and lightnings. This representation is then set in contradistinction to that subsequently made of the Son. The words as here quoted are exactly the same as those in the Septuagint, except in the form of the two last. They correspond also with the paraphrase given in the Targum, which however is more exegetical: "Who maketh his swift messengers as wind, his powerful ministers as flaming fire." But it has been said that another meaning than that usually given is not only allowed by the form of expression, but required by the context of the Psalm.

The first remark may be conceded. The Greek will bear the translation, 'who maketh winds his angels, (or messengers,) and a flaming fire his ministers;' and this is given by Diodati, Il qual fa i venti suoi angeli, et la fiamma del fuoco suoi ministri. Even the use of the articles in the Greek with *angels* and *ministers*, whilst they are omitted in the case of other nouns, does not positively preclude such a view. The poet may convey the thought, that to effect certain purposes of his providence, God employs some winds as all the messengers, and some lightnings as all the

* Hengstenberg's remarks on this clause of the Psalm are very extraordinary. "The Septuagint could not understand this representation, and substituted angels instead of gods, to whom what was said could apply only by an inference, as a majori ad minus: if the proud gods of the heathen cannot measure themselves with the Lord, how much less may the angels, Heb. i. 6."

τοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα· πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν· 8 ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ θεός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος· ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς 9 βασιλείας σου. Ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην

ministers a flame of fire. But unto 8 the Son *he saith*, Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness *is* the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved 9

---

ministering agents, that the occasion requires. But such a use of the article must be granted to be extremely rare, and the most natural sense to be that which regards *angels* and *ministers* as the subjects, and *winds* and *flame of fire* as the predicates. Thus the usage will correspond with that in the next two verses. And it is remarkable that this translation of the Septuagint, which the author sanctions, is given also in the Psalm by the Chaldee and Syriac versions. The probability from the grammatical argument is therefore in favour of this meaning.

The remark that the other translation is required by the context of the Psalm, cannot be proved. The Psalm commences with one of the noblest and most magnificent descriptions of God's greatness that can be conceived. Of this description these words are a part. They occur in connection with poetic imagery, which describes the Almighty as fixing his immutable creation, riding in his cloud-chariot, and moving on the winged winds. It cannot be denied that the sacred poet might have illustrated the majesty of his all-glorious subject, by making him employ winds as his messengers and flaming lightnings as his ministers; and this in perfect harmony with the context. But the assertion is that he must have done so, whereas it is undeniable that the other view given in the epistle is at least as much if not more in keeping with the general representation. God's infinite majesty is most fully declared in this, that the most dignified of his creatures, those who surround, as it were, his heavenly throne, are employed as his most ordinary agents.

Hengstenberg argues in favour of the other translation. The Psalmist speaks of God's *visible* glory. The same remark is made by Kuinoel in loc. and also by Dathe.* But, admitting this to be in general true, we cannot assume it to be so universally. In so brief a description, among a few illustrations drawn from visible and material objects, he may have introduced one from invisible and spiritual. *Angels* are mentioned in such a connection in Ps. cxlviii. 2, where they are required to praise God in company with "*sun and moon*, *stars*, *waters*," and other visible objects of nature. Allowing the reference to be, as Hengstenberg says, to the second day's work mentioned in Genesis, it will not follow that the Psalmist must introduce nothing but what is there expressly stated. He may have this

* In his Latin version of the Psalms. The author, John Augustus Dathe, published in Latin a translation of the whole of the Old Testament in six volumes 8vo, at Halle, 1784–1794, with brief but valuable notes. It has the great merit of unusual perspicuity.

righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, *even* thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of glad-

καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε, ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός σου ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιά-

---

account in view, and yet heighten the effect of his representation by introducing *angels* as he does *winds* and *lightnings*, although these agents are not mentioned in Genesis. It is not necessary to confine the poet to the very circumstances of the history. The reference to Ps. cv. 32, and cxlviii. 8, is of no weight, as they are not at all "parallel" to the case in hand. It is moreover particularly worthy of attention, that the word *angels* never elsewhere occurs in the Psalms in any other sense than that of the heavenly beings so called, except in lxxviii. 49, "he sent evil angels among them." The other places are the following: xxxiv. 7, xxxv. 5, 6, xci. 11, ciii. 20, civ. 4, cxlviii. 2. In viii. 5, lxviii. 17, lxxviii. 25, where the word is employed in the English translation, the Hebrew expressions are different.

It may not be amiss to remark, after Storr, although I would not attach an undue importance to the circumstance, that according to the interpretation above maintained, the position of the literal and figurative words in this verse corresponds with that in the former phrase—"who maketh the clouds his chariot,"—where the former, like *angels* and *ministers*, must be understood literally, and the latter, like *winds* and *lightnings*, figuratively for agents of his will.

8, 9. The remark made of angels in the preceding quotation is contrasted with the representation here given of the Son. He is addressed as God; royal and everlasting authority is predicated of him; the most perfect and entire uprightness of his government and character is stated as the ground of his joyous reward, which is above that of all other regal dignitaries in earth or heaven. These are particulars of vast importance.

Πρός, which in the former verse is properly rendered *concerning*, is here more properly perhaps expressed by *to*, as the clause precedes an address to the Son. The nominative ὁ θεός is undoubtedly the Attic, to be understood in a vocative sense. All attempts to sustain any other have failed. The phrase cannot be translated, 'God is thy throne,' for several reasons. 1. The predicate *throne* would be without the article, like the first *sceptre* in the next clause. 2. The use of such a figure is without any analogy to sustain it. God is called a rock, a sanctuary, a refuge, a fortress, a tower, &c.; but never a throne. 3. If this translation were even allowable, the meaning assigned to it by Rabbi Saadias the Gaon in Aben-Ezra, "God will establish thy throne," would not be correct. *Throne* would be figurative, and the proper meaning be *ruler*, as in Col. i. 16, "*thrones* and principalities and powers." But such a meaning would not comport with the fact, that the subject of the Psalm is himself represented

10 σεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου. Καί· σὺ κατ' ἀρχάς, κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρα-
11 νοί· αὐτοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, σὺ δὲ διαμένεις· καὶ πάντες ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσονται,

ness above thy fellows. And, Thou, 10 Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou 11

---

as the ruling monarch. This is certain, as the very next clause evinces; and the parallel places in 2 Sam. vii. 13, and Ps. lxxxix. 29, show, that the words "forever and ever" which immediately follow the clause "thy throne, O God," denote the perpetuity of the kingdom, not the eternity of him who is afterwards introduced as "thy God." This accords also with the concluding clause of the third verse: "God hath blessed thee *forever*." The attempt of Gesenius in his Lexicon to sustain another translation of the Hebrew, 'thy throne *of God*,' that is 'thy *divine* throne,' is truly surprising, as he must have known that, in such a case, the second of the two nouns, and not as here the first, would have had the suffix by common usage of the language. His reference to Levit. xxvi. 42, as an instance of contrary usage, is particularly unfortunate, as the case is essentially unlike, both on account of the proper names, and because the grammatical government of the words may be different.

The only correct translation then is, "Thy throne, O God." As this title is never applied to any Hebrew monarch, it must relate to some superhuman personage. And as what is predicated of this personage is not applicable even to an angel, we are not only justified, but compelled to regard him as truly divine. The Messiah is really God, but is spoken of at the same time in such a way as presumes a human nature also. This is the case in the 45th Psalm and throughout this first chapter; for whatever implies elevation must be predicated of some other nature than the divine.

The next statement relates to the government of King Messiah. In harmony with various prophetic representations, it is described as characterized by righteousness. See Ps. lxxii. 1–4, Isa. xi. 4, 5, xxxii. 1; to which a multitude of other places might be added.—To anoint with the oil of joy, is figurative of reward and happiness. See Isa. lxi. 3. This is here promised to the Messiah as the result of that perfect righteousness and holiness which essentially belong to him, which prompted him to come into the world in order to vindicate the law and to do and suffer the will of God, and which will ever lead him to conduct his divine reign on the principles of perfect justice and right.—"Thy fellows" is equivalent to 'those who, in common with thee, possess royal authority, whether in earth or heaven.'

10–12. These verses contain a quotation from Ps. cii. 25–27.—As the original passage seems to speak simply of the omnipotence and immutability of God in contradistinction to the changeable and transitory nature of all created things, it is not easy to see its relevancy to the pur-

remainest: and they all shall wax 12 old as doth a garment; And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up,

καὶ ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον ἑλίξεις αὐτούς, καὶ 12 ἀλλαγήσονται· σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, καὶ τὰ

---

pose for which it is quoted, which is, to show the high dignity of the Son. To resort to accommodation, or to suppose that the author avails himself of the Psalmist's language to embody his own idea, is to abandon the claim of argument, and to grant in effect that the two verses, in the connection in which they stand in the epistle, are useless. This is wholly improbable.

The 102d Psalm is considered by many very able commentators as having been composed towards the termination of the Babylonian captivity, or written with reference to that event and the return of the Jews to their own land. So Kimchi, Jarchi and Aben-Ezra, Munster, Clarius, Amama, Dathe, Rosenmueller and others. Hengstenberg indeed maintains that this Psalm is intimately connected with the 101st and 103d, and that the two latter of the three are but the full development of what we read in the first verses of the former, namely, the cry, "when wilt thou come unto me," and the resolution to "sing of mercy and judgment." Hence he infers that the 102d, as well as its associates, was written by David. He endeavours to sustain his view by remarking that the title contains analogous expressions to those elsewhere employed by the son of Jesse. How precarious such a course of argument must be is self-evident. He objects to the application of ver. 13 to Jeremiah's seventy years of the captivity,* that if these had been meant, the expression would have been much more definite; and yet to illustrate the next verse, he refers to Neh. iii. 34, iv. 4, (Heb., iv. 2, 10, Eng. Tr.) though he contends "that the stones and the dust belong here (in the Psalm) only to the *figure*." All this is evidently assumed. The supposition of figure is unnecessary, and the expression is sufficiently definite for the purpose. The character of the Psalm is in perfect keeping with the theory which connects it with the captivity, and this, whether we regard the author as delivering his personal feelings and hopes, or those of his church and people personified. The first part of it is descriptive of deep distress and affliction. The complaint, however, is mitigated by the consideration that God's mercies are continual and that Zion cannot fail to experience them, ver. 12, 13. "The set time to favour her" most probably refers to the prediction already mentioned. The re-establishment of Zion and Jerusalem appears very prominently in the body of the Psalm; and the connection of this restoration with the congregating of the Heathen to praise God accords with the representation made in the last division of Isaiah's prophecies. Comp. 13–16, 21, 22, with Isa. xl. 2, 5,

* Jer. xxv. 11, 12, xxix. 10. Comp. Dan. ix. 2, who probably refers to the recorded prediction of Jeremiah.

13 ἔτη σου οὐκ ἐκλείψουσι. Πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἴρηκέ ποτε· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου

and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail. But to which of the 13

---

xlix. 8, lii. 7–10. The afflicted Psalmist laments the diminution of his strength and the wasting of his life; and in uttering a prayer for support, he contrasts the brevity and transitoriness of his own earthly existence with the unfailing and changeless continuance of his God. In this connection the passage here cited occurs.

Presuming now that the prayer of which the quotation makes a part expresses the feelings of the Hebrew Church, or of some pious member pouring out his soul to that God who had brought the nation into being, protected it from infancy in all its diversified conditions, and raised it to lofty distinction among the celebrated kingdoms of the world; we are prepared for another remark, which may tend to illustrate the point under consideration. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews does most probably represent the being who gave the law to the Israelites as the Messiah, the divine Logos. The most natural interpretation of xii. 25, is that which places Moses and Christ in contrast to each other, as speaking respectively "on earth" or "from heaven." Yet of the latter he says in the next verse, "whose voice then shook the earth, but now he hath promised, saying, yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven." According to this most probable exposition, the Messiah is introduced as occasioning that shaking of Mount Sinai, which accompanied the giving of the law, and also as making the promise which is contained in Hag. ii. 6. There can hardly be a doubt that, like Stephen, (Acts vii. 30–38,) the author regards the angel who "appeared to Moses in the bush," who "gave the living oracles," and between whom and the people Moses was the Mediator, as Jehovah, "the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob." It was he who brought the Israelites out of Egypt, conducted them through the desert into the promised land, and thus showed himself to be their God and Saviour. The prevalence of this opinion in an early period of the Christian Church appears from several places in the fathers. It is also worthy of note that, in the Epistle of St. Jude, ver. 5, where we read, "*the Lord*, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt," the Alexandrine and other ancient manuscripts, with several important versions, have substituted the word *Jesus*. The former is no doubt the true reading, but the fact that the latter is found in such old and numerous authorities, is a striking illustration of the prevailing opinion. Analogy therefore would suggest to us, that the same divine Logos became the deliverer of the people from Babylon, and their restorer to their own land. The Jehovah-Angel who appeared to the Patriarchs,* who "led Jacob all his life long," who

* See my Companion to the Book of Genesis, Note 81, pp. 263-271.

angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? 14 Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?

ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου; 14 Οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα, εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν;

---

commissioned Moses, may well be supposed to have been regarded by the Hebrew Church or pious individuals during the captivity, as he whose aid they were to invoke, and whom they were to recognise as the omnipotent and immutable God. On this theory, the difficulty in admitting the argument in the quotation vanishes.

If it should be replied that, on such a principle we may predicate of Christ several ascriptions of praise to God that are contained in the Old Testament, and consequently find confirmation of his superiority to angels wherever such occur; the believer in his true deity need not hesitate to admit the conclusion, as praise to God implies praise to the divine Logos. Let it be observed, however, that what may confirm an already existing faith may nevertheless be inadequate to produce it. Still, if what has been said respecting the origin of the Psalm, and the superintendence of the Logos in conducting the captives back to their own land, be allowed, the direct application to that Being of language which otherwise might seem most appropriate to the Holy Trinity, will appear the more natural.

13, 14. So far from representing any one of the angels as elevated to the distinction of a seat at the right hand of God, to be held until the final subjection of all his foes; they are all, without exception, ministering agents despatched by God to serve those members of the human family who shall receive that eternal inheritance which the heir and lord of all will bestow. The quotation from Ps. cx. 1, relates exclusively to the Messiah. Two Chaldee Targums are extant on this Psalm, one of which attempts to explain it of David, but is obliged to introduce matter wholly at variance with the original composition. The other interprets it of the Messiah, in accordance with Matt. xxii. 44. Both may be found in Walton's Polyglot.

Chap. ii. 1, 2. "Therefore:" the inference results from the superiority of the dispensation of the Messiah, shown by the representation just made of his nature and character, over the Mosaic. The *word* or *doctrine* or *religious system*, is said to have been spoken by angels, because they were made instrumental in introducing the law. This is stated elsewhere, and always in honour of the dispensation. See Acts vii. 53, Gal. iii. 19, and comp. Deut. xxxiii. 2. In the last text *saints* or *holy ones* is equivalent to *angels;* a word which the Septuagint introduces in the next clause.—"Lest we should let them slip." Various shades of meaning have been

II. Διὰ τοῦτο δεῖ περισσοτέρως ἡμᾶς προσέχειν τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσι, μήποτε παραρ-
2 ῥυῶμεν. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος ἐγένετο βέβαιος, καὶ πᾶσα παράβασις καὶ παρακοὴ ἔλαβεν ἔνδικον μισ-
3 θαποδοσίαν, πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τηλικαύτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας; ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβε-
4 βαιώθη, συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ

II. Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let *them* slip. 2 For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward; 3 How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, *and* was confirmed unto us by them that heard *him;* 4 God also bearing *them*

---

ascribed to the original word: either that just given; or, 'lest we glide (pass) away from them;' or, 'lest we suffer them to pass away,' in other words, 'forget them;' or, 'lest we flow,' that is, 'fall away.' "We fleten away:" Wiclif; "perysshe:" Tyndale and Cranmer; "shulde not kepe them:" Geneva; "we runne out:" Rheims. The word is figurative, taken probably from a temporary stream swollen by the rains, which soon runs out and comes to nothing; or else, from waters which glide by and are lost.

4. It is doubtful whether the pronoun *his own* should qualify *God* or the *Spirit.* The parallel place in 1 Cor. xii. 11, is in favour of the latter. In either case, the ubiquity and personal agency of the Spirit in effecting the operations mentioned are necessarily implied.

5–8. "The world (or age) to come" is a common Jewish phrase to denote Messiah's kingdom, and is set in contradistinction to 'this world or age.' But it is never expressed by οἰκουμένη as here, but always by αἰών. See Isa. ix. 6, Sept., Heb. vi. 5. Still the connection shows that the term, which properly denotes the inhabited world, can have here no other meaning than Messiah's kingdom as established at the commencement of his glorification, to be extended over all the world, and to continue forever. The author does not imply that angels had "been rulers" of the preceding dispensation, as Whitby and Pierce assume; he only asserts that the ruler of the dispensation of which he is speaking is a man, and that angels are clothed with no such authority. Hence he pursues his argument respecting the incarnate Messiah's superiority.

The quotation from the 8th Psalm is plainly intended as proof, and cannot be accommodated. Its author appears to have in view the original supremacy of man as lord of the lower world, and consequently as holding all inferior animals in subjection. The expression "all things" might seem to be most fairly interpreted by means of the specifications immediately following, "all sheep and oxen," &c. An unassisted reader of the Psalm

witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according
5 to his own will? For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof
6 we speak. But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou
7 visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and hon-

σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασι καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν. Οὐ γὰρ 5 ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξε τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν. Διεμαρ- 6 τύρατο δέ πού τις λέγων· τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμνήσκῃ αὐτοῦ; ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι ἐπισκέπτῃ αὐτόν; Ἠλάτ- 7 τωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους·

---

would probably be unable to see any farther meaning. But the author of the Epistle is careful to insist upon the most unlimited signification of this phrase as the very foundation of his argument. "In that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him." In his view then the context must not be adduced to restrict the universality of the supremacy affirmed. Are we then to conclude that he distorts the meaning of the Psalm, in order to maintain his argument? Certainly not. He offers no violence to the Psalm. He only develops a meaning not evident on the face of the passage. What is said, in a degree limited by the context, of the first man when he came perfect from his Maker's hand, and was intended also in a still more limited degree of his sinful posterity, the writer of the Epistle affirms without any limitation whatever of the greatest man, the last Adam, the incarnate Messiah. If we regard the Psalm as speaking of human nature, its language will be applicable in various degrees correspondent with the variety of human character, and consequently in the highest and most unlimited degree to Christ.

The phrase "son of man" here and in many other places is equivalent to 'man,' though in the gospels it is always used by and of the Messiah. The original words for "a little," both in Hebrew and Greek, might be rendered, 'for a little while;' and this is sanctioned by Tyndale and the Geneva version, which have "for a season." But this would not be in harmony with the context. Wiclif, Cranmer and the Rheims' version agree with our authorized translation: "A litil les—a litle lower—minish him litle lesse." The last clause of the quotation is cited by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 27, and Eph. i. 22, and in both places with direct reference to Christ. Comp. also Phil. iii. 21, which evidently alludes to the same text. It is remarkable too that in Corinthians the universality of the subjection is also stated, the only exception being the subjector himself.

Presuming now that the subject of this part of the Psalm is human nature, the argument of the Epistle may be stated thus. 'Messiah's

δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτὸν, [καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν 8 χειρῶν σου]· πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον· νῦν δὲ οὔπω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ 9 πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα· τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον, ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανά-

our, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: Thou hast 8 put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing *that is* not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him: But we see Jesus, 9 who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every

---

glorious kingdom is not under the control of angels, but of a man.' This truth is conveyed in the comprehensive language of the 8th Psalm, where it is said that human nature, created originally but a little lower than angelic, is raised to supreme honour, every earthly thing being put under it. We do not indeed even yet see that this subjection has taken effect as regards man in general, but Jesus who took upon him that nature we do see crowned with glory and honour, and raised to universal supremacy as a reward of the humiliation which he underwent in sustaining sufferings and death.

The clause, "on account of the suffering of death," may be connected either with the preceding or subsequent one. The former connection gives as a reason for our Lord's incarnation, that he might thereby become capable of suffering and death. The latter makes his elevation the reward of his sufferings; and this is most in accordance with other passages, and especially the latter clause of ver. 10. The idea given on the former construction is conveyed in the last clause of the verse. Stuart renders it thus: "After that by the grace of God he had tasted death for all." He adduces a considerable array of authorities to prove that ὅπως means *after that.* But although the word occurs 56 times in the New Testament, there is no clear case of this signification. The only instance which he refers to is Acts iii. 19, where the usual sense of *that* makes as good a meaning. The connection of this clause is with the first part of the verse. Such a collocation is not without parallel cases. See Mark xvi. 4, the last words of which "for it was very great," are connected with ver. 3; "who shall roll away the stone?" and Ps. xx. 6, where the last clause qualifies the first. Another instance occurs in Acts v. 39, the latter clause of which, "lest ye fight against God," is a reason for what was said in the former part of the 38th, "refrain from these men."

10. The author, having shown that the humanity of Christ was not even originally very far below the angelic condition, and that its subse-

10 man. For it became him, for whom *are* all things, and by whom *are* all things, in bringing many

του. Ἔπρεπε γὰρ αὐτῷ, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα 10 καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς

---

quent elevation was greatly above it, proceeds to give a reason for the divine arrangement in making this elevation a reward of sufferings. It was in analogy with God's nature and ordinary course of procedure. The distinction between *διά* with an accusative, *on account of*, and with a genitive, *by*, is here very clearly marked. The remainder of the verse admits of two constructions. The participle may relate to God, the subject of the preceding part of the verse. It is not necessary that it should be in the same case with the pronoun; it may be the accusative before the infinitive. Such usage is not at all unfrequent. The following instance occurs in Xenophon. Ὁ δὲ Κῦρος ἐπέστελλεν Ἀδουσίῳ, συμμίξαντα πρὸς Ὑστάσπαν, ... ἄγειν.* The translation will be: 'That he (God) leading many sons to glory should perfect,' &c.

On the other hand, *ἀγαγόντα*, may agree with *ἀρχηγὸν* governed by *τελειῶσαι*, and the translation be: 'It became him * * * to perfect through sufferings the captain of their salvation leading many sons to glory.' Stuart adopts this. It is natural to represent the captain or prince as the leader, and the redeemed are afterwards mentioned as children in verses 13, 14. Still it may be replied, that they are also mentioned as brethren in verses 11, 12, 17, and in Rom. viii. 29; and this representation harmonizes best with the view which makes both Christ and his redeemed to be sons of the Father. On the whole, therefore, the former construction seems preferable; and it has the sanction of the most ancient versions, and the old English translations of Wiclif, Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva and Rheims.

The Aorist *ἀγαγόντα* may be taken in a present sense, or convey the idea of intention or habit. It cannot possibly be limited to action entirely passed. The *many* sons of God may stand in contradistinction to his *one* Son in a peculiar sense. Δι' οὗ may have been preferred to ἐξ, (which is used in Rom. xi. 36, and 1 Cor. viii. 6,) on account of the preceding *δι' ὅν*.

The last clause of the verse has been interpreted in two ways. Τελειῶσαι has been supposed to express the consecration of Christ to his priestly office; and it has also been thought to denote his elevation to a perfectly exalted condition in heaven as Lord of the universe, to whom all power in heaven and earth has been committed.

The former of these two views is maintained by Whitby, who argues in its defence as follows. 1. From v. 8, 9, where he translates, "being consecrated to his priestly office." From vii. 28, where he translates, "who

* Cyrop. vii. 4, tom. iii. p. 54, Opera Edit. Schneider and Zeun.

δόξαν ἀγαγόντα τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι.	sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect

is consecrated." But this is nothing less than begging the question, as there is no sufficient reason to suppose this to be the meaning in these passages, and he makes no attempt to prove it. 2. He argues from comparing Aaron's priesthood with Christ's. "The consecration of Aaron and the legal priests is continually expressed by this word. For what is in the Hebrew, thou shalt fill the hands of Aaron and his sons, and is by us translated, thou shalt consecrate them, is by the Septuagint thus rendered, τελειώσεις Ἀαρὼν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἁγιάσαι αὐτούς.* So Num. iii. 3, ἐτελείωσαν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν [τοῦ] ἱερατεύειν, they consecrated them to the priesthood. Accordingly, the priest consecrated is in the Greek, ὁ τετελειωμένος, Levit. xxi. 10." But this is not an accurate statement of the case. The legal phraseology is somewhat different. When τελειῶσαι is used in the Septuagint to express the sense of consecration, it is connected with the word *hands*, and the literal translation is *to fill the hands.* The reason for such a use of the phrase is probably to be found in Ex. xxix. 24, "And thou shalt put all" (namely the articles previously mentioned,) "in the hands of Aaron and in the hands of his sons." This was a part of the service, and it gave rise to a phrase expressive of the consecration itself. There is only one instance in which the word for *hands* is omitted in the Vatican manuscript, Levit. xxi. 10, and even here it is read in the Alexandrine, and printed in the editions of Breitinger and Grabe. And although the word τελείωσις, perfection, does occur alone for *consecration*, yet the connection always points out the origin and meaning of the term. See the places referred to by Whitby, Exod. xxix. 34, Levit. viii. 22, 28, 33. Peirce, in his Paraphrase, combines both views: "To make perfectly qualified for and consecrated to his office by sufferings;" remarking, in a note, that the word "must in general import the same as *crowning with glory and honour*," and that "both senses of it are inserted in the Paraphrase."

Dr. Hammond paraphrases the words, "*come to his reward and crown*," referring to his note on Phil. iii. 12, where, in illustration of the words "were perfect," he says: "So, Heb. ii. 10, God was pleased to *crown* or consummate the captain of our salvation by sufferings. So Heb. xii. 23, the just that have *received their reward*." And yet, with singular inconsistency, on Heb. v. 9, he places in the margin "consummate or *consecrated*," and in the paraphrase, "*consecrated* by his sufferings, as the priest by the ceremonies of his consecration, and being so *consecrated*," &c.

In addition to what has been said, it may be remarked, that it is difficult to conceive how suffering could be the means of consecrating Christ to his

* I give this as it occurs in Whitby, although I cannot find these words in the Septuagint, and doubt the accuracy of the quotation.

11 through sufferings. For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified *are* all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them

Ὅ τε γὰρ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες· δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν, λέ- 11

---

priestly office. The sufferings were themselves sacrificial and atoning; consequently, in his capacity as offerer, he must have been priest before the suffering commenced. The theory under consideration would do away the sacrificial character of Christ's offering on the cross, and conflict with the whole scope of the ninth chapter.

On the contrary, the other view is natural. It accords with the usual divine procedure, that Christ's elevation to supremacy over the universe, should be conferred on him as the reward of his unparalleled humiliation, submission, and sufferings, and this is expressly stated in various parts of the New Testament. And moreover an examination of all the places in this Epistle where the word occurs confirms the correctness of this view. Thus it is said of Christ in verse 9, "being made perfect," that is, raised to the highest possible degree of power and glory; vii. 28, the Son elevated to the most exalted state of *power*, in contradistinction to high-priests marked by human *weaknesses*. And in the other places in which the verb or noun occurs, it will be found that *perfection* in reference to the subject spoken of is always the leading thought. Thus in vii. 19, "the law made nothing perfect;" its weakness and inadequacy are given as the reason why it could not accomplish the required end; comp. vii. 11: in ix. 9, "to perfect the worshipper," that is, to give him solid grounds of acceptance with God. So in x. 1. And the same general idea of advancement to perfect holiness and happiness pervades the remaining three places, x. 14, xi. 40, xii. 23. Comp. τελειωθείς, *made perfect*, in Wisdom of Sol. iv. 13, where it expresses *high advancement in sanctity*.

11. He that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified; in other words, he that atoneth and they that are atoned for. The Hebrew, who needed an offering of atonement for any offence whether ceremonial or moral, was regarded as impure or unholy until the prescribed sacrifice had been made. Then his impurity was considered as removed and he as holy. Thus to make holy or sanctify and to atone for, are expressed by the same word. See Heb. ix. 13, where it is used of fleshly purification. The *sanctified* or *holy* thus becomes an appellation of Christians, regarded as atoned for and being what they profess to be. See 1 Cor. i. 2. Comp. also vii. 14, where the Christian character of one of the married parties is represented as conferring a relative holiness on the other although not Christian, and also on their children, who would otherwise be considered as not *holy* but *unclean* or in a Heathen state. Comp. Acts x. 28.

Of one *father*, say some; either Abraham (ver. 16,) or Adam, or God. Cardinal Hugo explains it by ex patre, and immediately quotes Eph. iii. 15,

12 γων· ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμ-13 νήσω σε. Καὶ πάλιν· ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πε-ποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ· καὶ πάλιν· ἰδοὺ

brethren; Saying, I will declare 12 thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the Church will I sing praise unto thee. And again, I 13

"from whom every *paternity* in heaven and earth is named," following of course the Vulgate, omnis *paternitas.* Verse 10 and the term *brethren* here are in favour of the last view. If the gender would allow it, we might understand the word *nature*, meaning *human*, which it is the design of the context to show appertains equally to Christ and his redeemed.

With the phrase "he is not ashamed," compare xi. 16. The language is there used of God avowing himself as the protector and friend of those who earnestly seek him. It seems difficult to account for its use in this connection, if he that sanctifies is nothing but a mere man like his brethren whom he has sanctified.

12, 13. The quotations in these verses have been considered by commentators in general as very embarrassing. There is but little difficulty connected with the first, which is from Ps. xxii. 22. No consistent and well sustained interpretation can be given of this Psalm, which does not regard the subject of it as chiefly, if not exclusively, the suffering and delivered Messiah. It is he, who with holy and grateful devotion announces his resolution to praise God in the assembly of the Saints, whom he recognises as *his own brethren.* This is the point for which the quotation is made. The Psalmist represents the Messiah under the image of a much afflicted and deeply pious Hebrew, who, when divinely rescued from his persecutors and restored to a condition of happiness, offers his thanksgiving to his gracious liberator. The idea of a righteous person, first in great affliction and then wonderfully delivered, is the leading thought of the Psalm; and in the development of this thought several particulars occur which, in all probability, have no historical subject in view, and others which can only be understood by a reference to certain particulars in the evangelical account of our Lord's crucifixion. The chief exegetical difficulties are confined to the quotations in the next verse.

Here it is a matter of doubt whether the first quotation, "I will put my trust in him," is taken from Ps. xviii. 2, (Sept. xvii. 3,) or the parallel place in 2 Sam. xxii. 3, or from Isa. viii. 17. Most expositors prefer the last reference, where in the Septuagint the words are the same as those here used. As the next quotation is from the immediately following verse of Isaiah, it has been objected that it would hardly in that case have been introduced with the formula, "and again." But this is of little or no weight, as that depends very much on the author's intention to make two distinct statements, and a similar passage occurs in x. 30, where two clauses from Deut. xxxii. 35, 36, are cited as distinct quotations, the latter being introduced

will put my trust in him. And ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία, ἅ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ again, Behold I and the children

---

with the same formula. The only difference is, that in Deuteronomy the second clause is not so closely connected with the first as is the case in Isaiah.

The words in Isaiah do appear to me to have been originally intended of the prophet himself and his own children. We are, says he, "for signs and wonders in Israel from the Lord of Hosts:" viii. 18. The meaning of this is made clear by the context and other prophetic passages. The birth of the prophet's son, *Mahershalalhashbaz*, is mentioned in the beginning of the chapter. His name signifies *hastens the spoil*, *hurries on the booty*, and was given him by divine direction to indicate that so soon as he should be able to utter the first articulate accents of affection, the King of Assyria should plunder the kingdoms of Israel and Syria, the accomplishment of which is referred to in Isa. x. 6, and 2 Kings xv. 29, 30, xvi. 9. *Shearjashub*, another son, has also a symbolic name, meaning *a remnant shall return*, and pointing out the fact, that however frequent and great might be the excisions by which at various times the nation should be distressed and weakened, a portion should still be preserved, and also the corresponding fact, that a remnant of religious devoted worshippers of Jehovah should be preserved, and, after all the nation's errors and sins, should "return to the living God," x. 21. As I can see no evidence to prove that Isaiah had a son named Emmanuel, I shall not add this personage, whom I hold to be identical with the Messiah, as another illustration.

But the name of the prophet himself must not be omitted in this category. *The salvation* or *deliverance of Jehovah* is too striking a meaning to be accounted for as a mere casual incident. What now does Isaiah mean when he says, "I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and wonders?" He means undoubtedly that the names of himself and sons are prophetic. They are indicative of extraordinary things to come, of divine interpositions in behalf of the true Israel of God, and signs of favourable interference. We have the same language in a similar sense in xx. 3, where Isaiah is represented as acting in such a way as to become "a sign and a wonder to Egypt and to Ethiopia," that is, to indicate their wonderful overthrow. And in Zech. iii. 8, what our English translation renders, "men wondered at," is literally, *men of wonder*, meaning, persons who in some extraordinary manner indicate and adumbrate the future. No reasonable doubt therefore can exist that Isaiah speaks of himself and his own children, and any attempt to dissever the 16th, 17th and 18th verses from the context, and to make them the language of the Messiah, while what proceeds and follows is that of the prophet, only

14 θεός. Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ παιδία κεκοινώνηκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός, καὶ αὐτὸς

which God hath given me. Forasmuch then as the children are par- 14

betrays the weakness of a theory of interpretation which is obliged to avail itself of so inefficient an aid.*

But how is the application of Isaiah's language to the fact, that the Messiah, in common with his brethren, or children, (that is, disciples,) partook of the same human nature, to be explained? It may be said, that the writer does not intend to interpret the words of Isaiah as relating to the Messiah; he merely represents him as declaring his confidence in God under difficulties, and as recognising his true disciples as his dear children, in the language of the prophet, and alludes to such expressions as we read in Matt. xxvi. 39, 42, last clauses, and in John xiii. 33, xxi. 5. But it appears to me preferable and more in harmony with other portions of Scripture, to explain this application on another principle. "Let it be considered that the priestly, prophetic and kingly offices of the Hebrews were institutions of divine appointment and sanction. They were established not merely for the general purposes of religious instruction, worship and government, but also as symbolical institutions, bearing evidence of their own imperfection and also promise of a better establishment to come, and of a personage who should fully concentrate in himself whatever might be necessary to the perfection of the character and the office. Such a view harmonizes with the nature of the dispensation. The Hebrew prophet, priest or king, is therefore not to be regarded as an isolated individual. He is officially connected with him who was to come, and properly to execute these high and important functions. The inspired Hebrew, therefore, when speaking of any one of those dignitaries, would naturally have his mind directed to the office. He would not be limited by any individual subject of discourse, even if his original purpose should have related to one person. Rather he would have in view the official character, the whole consecutive line of individuals composing it, and of course Christ, as the very essential perfection of their nature, whom they all adumbrated, and in whom they all centred."† On this principle Isaiah and his sons must not be disconnected from the idea of the prophetic body of which Christ was the head and soul. They are, in common with other divinely appointed Hebrew prophets, symbols and adumbrations of the great prophet, and therefore language originally intended of them was also intended to comprehend the Messiah and the members of his mystical body.

14, 15. It is unnecessary to swell this note with accounts of Jewish

* The reader who wishes to see a very plausible defence of this interpretation is referred to Peirce's note *f*.

† Thoughts on Prophecy, pp. 93, 94.

takers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of 15 death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time sub-16 ject to bondage. For verily he

παραπλησίως μετέσχε τῶν αὐτῶν, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸν διάβολον, καὶ ἀπαλλάξῃ τούτους, 15 *ὅσοι φόβῳ θανάτου διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας. Οὐ γὰρ δήπου* 16

---

fables about Sammael or Asmodæus, the angel of death, or disquisitions of certain Christian expositors respecting the devil's control over death, and the knowledge of a future life developed by Christ as removing apprehension of death and what might follow it from the minds of those who received the Gospel. The curious are referred to Grotius, Wetstein and other commentators and critics. See also Eisenmenger's Entdecktes Judenthum, (Judaism disclosed,) Part I. chap xviii., pp. 820–836, and Buxtorf's Talmudic Lexicon under Sammael, col. 1495. Valuable remarks on some of these points may be found in Tholuck.—The devil's agency in bringing sin into human nature, which is taught in the history of the fall, probably also in John viii. 44, and was admitted by the Jews long before the Christian era, (Wisdom of Sol. ii. 24,) together with the consequences, death physical and spiritual, and the terrific apprehensions thus produced in the minds of men who knew nothing of a remedy for these evils, fully justifies the author's representation of the devil's power over death, which he was *permitted* thus to exercise, (compare Luke iv. 6, "*is delivered* unto me,") and the slavish terrour of those whom he had thus subjugated. And the New Testament abounds with evidence to show that Christ, by his voluntary atoning death in his incarnate state of humiliation, and by his self-caused resurrection and glorious ascension to heaven, hath triumphed over this and every foe, and redeemed men from their natural sinful state of wretched thraldom.

16. Δήπου, by no means, certainly not.—Our English translation follows the older versions, according to the generally prevailing meaning from a very ancient period. The old italic is, *he did not assume angels;* nec enim statim angelos adsumsit: The Vulgate, somewhat more in accordance with the meaning of the verb, *he did not apprehend* angels; nusquam enim angelos apprehendit. Wiclif translates: "he took never aungels, but he took the seed of Abraham;" Tyndale and Cranmer: "*taketh on hym* the angels, but the seede of Abraham *taketh he on hym.*" To the same purpose the Geneva translation: "For he in no sort *tooke* the angels, but *he tooke* the seede of Abraham;" also that of Rheims. The words "him the nature of" are quite unwarrantably introduced in King James's Bible, and the same remark applies to certain other words which appear elsewhere, although the Greek contains nothing corresponding, as, for example, Matt. xv. 6, xx. 23, Mark. vii. 11, x. 40. Castalio has given the right meaning: non enim

ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρ-
17 ματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται. Ὅθεν ὤφειλε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι, ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, εἰς τὸ
18 ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ. Ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθείς, δύναται τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθῆσαι.

took not on *him the nature of* angels; but he took on *him* the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in 17 all things it behoved him to be made like unto *his* brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest in things *pertaining* to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people: For in that he 18 himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

---

angelis opitulatur; for he does not assist angels. Ἐπιλαμβάνομαι means *to take hold of in order to help*, and is very properly rendered *assist.* It is used in this sense in the apocryphal book of Sirach, iv. 11, 'Wisdom refresheth her children, and *aids* (ἐπιλαμβάνεται) them that seek her. And the same idea, along with that of parental tenderness, is implied in the phrase in Jeremiah xxxviii. (Sept., xxxi. Heb.,) 32, "In the day that I *took them by the hand.*" Peile's translation introduces this phrase from the prophet: "For beyond all question, it is not angels that he is taking by the hand, but Abraham's seed (Rom. iv. 13, Gal. iii. 16,) it is that he is taking by the hand." Thus the proposition in the Epistle gives a reason for the incarnation: it is not angels that Christ helps, but he helps the (spiritual) progeny of Abraham.

17, 18. The point stated in the former verse affords a reason both for the incarnation of Christ before spoken of, and also for his exposure to the same trials and temptations to which his brethren are subjected. Our Lord was not only tried by various afflictions incident to human life, but tempted also to choose what would not have comported with the will of his father, however it might accord with that law of nature which prompts the desire to avoid pain and suffering; a desire not in itself sinful. He always freely yielded to the divine requisition, and thus, though tempted, ever remained sinless. "*All* things," must, of course, be limited by the context and the nature of the case, and the author has himself expressly stated the limitation in iv. 15, "without sin." The appellation, "high-priest," must be understood in its proper, definite meaning, as is shown by the mention of propitiating which immediately follows, and by numerous places in the Epistle, and the general train of thought in chapters vii.–x. The epithets *faithful* and *merciful*, may both apply to Christ in his priestly connection with men, implying not only his loving and merciful disposition towards them, but also the reliableness of his priestly interference on their behalf. But the chief reference of the former rather seems to be to God, as we find it affirmed in iii. 2. There may also be an allusion to the promise in 1 Sam. ii. 35, "I will raise me

up a *faithful* priest that shall do according to that which is in mine heart."

The idea in these verses is evidently resumed in iv. 14, 15, where the language also is in part the same.

SECTION II.

CHAP. III.—VI.

CHRIST AS HEAD OF GOD'S CHURCH SUPERIOR TO MOSES; WITH INSTRUCTIONS AND EXHORTATIONS.

III. Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High-Priest

Ὅθεν, ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, III.

THE first two chapters may be regarded as a distinct section, in which the dignity of Christ, both in his originally divine and chiefly in his glorified incarnate condition, is represented and proved. He that introduced the dispensation of the Gospel, although a man, is, by the elevation to which he has been raised as a reward of his sufferings, more distinguished and glorious than the angels, who were God's agents in establishing the Mosaic dispensation. The author now proceeds to compare him with Moses, and to point out his superiority as the founder of a divine system of religion. On this ground he urges the Hebrew Christians to adhere to the Gospel, and to shun any approach to apostasy.

iii. 1. What has been said is abundant ground for the exhortation which this verse contains, to give attentive consideration to Jesus as the distinguished apostle of God, and as the commissioned high-priest of the Christian dispensation. The phrase "of our profession" may be taken in a subjective sense and regarded as equivalent to 'whom we profess;' or objectively for the Gospel itself. The words "apostle and high-priest" both imply dignity, but they are not to be limited to this idea. They mean also one sent by God and exercising properly the high-priestly office. Tholuck remarks from the Talmud,* that on the feast of expiation the high-priest appeared before God as the people's mediator, and as such received the appellation of *the sent*, that is, the representative of the Sanhedrim. If the author of the Epistle has this usage in mind, it may serve to explain his uniting together the ideas of apostle and high-priest. Still, as Christ was properly both, it was quite natural so to represent him. "Holy brethren" is synonymous with

* Joma i. 5, Edit. Surenhusii, vol. ii. p. 209.

2	Ἰησοῦν, πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ	of our profession, Christ Jesus; Who was faithful to him that ap-	2
3	αὐτοῦ. Πλείονος γὰρ οὗτος δόξης παρὰ Μωϋσῆν ἠξίωται, καθ' ὅσον πλείονα	pointed him, as also Moses *was faithful* in all his house. For this *man* was counted worthy of more	3

"the sanctified," as explained on ii. 11. The "heavenly calling" is the Christian condition of reconciliation to God, and covenant claim to all the blessings of Messiah's kingdom both here and hereafter. It is called heavenly, on account of its origin, nature and ultimate result. The word "calling" is frequently used in the sense of *state*, *condition*. See 1 Cor. i. 26, vii. 20, Eph. iv. 1, to which other places might be added, though their meaning is not so clear. He who calls men out of the world into this condition is God. See Rom. viii. 30, ix. 24, 1 Cor. i. 9, vii. 15, Gal. i. 6, 1 Thess. ii. 12, 1 Pet. v. 10, 2 Pet. i. 3. He does it generally by human instrumentality.

2. The fidelity of Jesus to God who had constituted him head of his church is mentioned in connection with that of Moses. Both were faithful. The author alludes to Num. xii. 7: "Moses is faithful in all my house." For the use of ποιέω in the sense of appointing, see Mark iii. 14, Acts ii. 36, and 1 Sam. xii. 6. The house or family is God's church; in reference to Moses the Hebrew, and to Christ the Christian.

3, 4. The third verse has been made the subject of some very unwarrantable glosses. The comparison, especially when taken in connection with the next verse, has been thought obscure, and therefore some have attempted to make it clearer. Peirce in his paraphrase introduces a clause which has nothing correspondent in the original: "This man was entitled to more honour and glory than Moses, inasmuch as he is *much more nearly related to* the head and founder of the family." The words in italics are manifestly an addition to those of the text. In his note he remarks that the "author seems to have omitted one part of his argument, leaving it to be supplied by his readers, it being not very obscure when all things are considered. (!) Thus then I understand his reasoning: 'The nearer the relation is in which any one stands to the head of the family who has the greatest honour therein, the greater honour must that person have in the family by virtue of that relation. But Christ, as a Son, is more nearly related to God, the head of the church which is his family, than was Moses as a servant. Therefore Christ is worthy of more honour than Moses.'" The argument, he says, is an enthymeme. Morus, as is stated by Rosenmueller in loc., gives nearly the same view. "He who is greatest in the family hath the greater honour. The order therefore should be thus: God, as sending, greater than Jesus; Christ, as sent by the father; Moses." Storr's translation is as follows: "For his superiority to Moses is the

glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath 4 more honour than the house. For every house is builded by some *man;* but he that built all things 5 *is* God. And Moses verily *was*

τιμὴν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου ὁ κατασκευάσας αὐτόν. Πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος κατασκευάζεται 4 ὑπό τινος, ὁ δὲ τὰ πάντα κατασκευάσας, θεός. Καὶ Μωϋσῆς μὲν πιστὸς ἐν 5 ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ὡς θεράπων, εἰς

---

greater, in proportion as this house is the more highly estimated by its founder." These commentators seem more intent on discovering or rather inventing what they may regard as a good and clear meaning, than in ascertaining the simple sense of the author's words.

The meaning usually given is most likely the true one. The figure is taken from a building or family, either of which is expressed by the Greek, although the latter is the more probable. In favour of the former it has been said, that the master of a family is not of course the most honourable, as a son or even a servant may become his superior. But it is sufficient for the author's purpose, that the statement is true as regards the general relation which the domestic head sustains to the members. Christ is represented as the founder of the family, (a representation abundantly sustained by the argument in the first chapter,) and consequently its legitimate head and lord, to whom the whole family must be inferior, and much more any portion or individual of it, as was Moses. This view is given by the authors in the Critici Sacri. The 4th verse is probably not parenthetical, but connected with the preceding. The former half of it is merely introductory to the latter, which *asserts* indeed no more than this, that the founder and maker of all things is God, but *implies* (as may be gathered from the connection and from the first chapter,) that Christ is that founder and maker.

5, 6. The comparison in these verses is plain. The fidelity of Moses in God's "household the church" was that of a trusty servant in the establishment; Christ's is that of a beloved and honoured Son presiding over it, directing all its members and controlling all its concerns. The house or family is God's, agreeably to the original usage in Num. xii. 7. The English translation in the Epistle, ver. 6, "his *own* house" is founded on the reading αὑτοῦ, which appears also in the Vulgate, in domo *sua*. The Italic read αὐτοῦ *ejus*, *his* house. The Syriac bears either meaning. According to the latter, the house throughout will be God's, whereas the former makes a transition to Christ, whose supremacy will be shown both by the preposition "over" and the pronoun "his own." If this were the writer's intention, most probably, as Tholuck suggests, he would have employed some such term as ἴδιον. The older English translations vary. Tyndale and Cranmer have: "over the house;" Geneva: "over his owne house;" Wiclif: "in his hous;" Rheims: "in his owne house." The words, "for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after," are

6 *μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων, Χριστὸς δὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ· οὗ οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, ἐάνπερ τὴν παῤῥησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος μέχρι*
7 *τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν. Διό, καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, σή-*

faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after. But Christ as a Son over 6 his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end. Wherefore, as the 7

---

frequently explained of Moses as attesting the truth of what he was commissioned to declare. But the future tense of the participle rather suggests a reference to those doctrines and facts which were to be announced in the Gospel, and of which the Mosaic system was typical and preparatory. This is in harmony with other parts of the Epistle: See viii. 5, ix. 8, 23, x. 1. It should be noted, that the condition of continuance in God's family is a steady maintenance of Christian character and perseverance in Christian confiding hope to the end of life. This is expressed by the phrase *the boldness and joyousness of hope*, implying that to possess such a hope, is the Christian's privilege and characterizes his religious nature. Καύχημα, both here and in some other places, is better rendered *rejoicing* or *ground of rejoicing* than *boast*. See Rom. iv. 2, and compare the use of the verb in v. 2, 3, 11.

7–12. The quotation is from Ps. xcv. 7–11, (xciv. 8–11, Sept.) Either the author puts his own exhortation in the words of the Psalmist, or by quoting these words he states a similar case to that of his own and the Hebrews whom he is addressing, and begins his exhortation with "Take heed" in ver. 12. The latter is much the more probable arrangement, although the remark of Peirce, that "to connect *wherefore* with some part of the citation is manifestly absurd," is extravagant. There is a close connection between the concluding remark of the 6th verse and the exhortation in the 12th, the holding fast to the end, and the guarding against such an unbelieving temper of mind as tends to apostasy.

The address of David is ascribed to the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as he is its original author, and thus the dignity of the speaker gives additional weight to the expostulation. The quotation agrees with the Septuagint, except that the latter connects "forty years" with the next verse, omitting the intermediate particle "wherefore," for which there is nothing in the Hebrew. It is probably thrown in by the Apostle. The general meaning will be the same. In the one case it will *imply* that the Hebrews, who for forty years were witnesses of God's works, during that whole period by habitually revolting constantly provoked God's indignation; in the other, it will *assert* its continuance during the same period.—Οὗ in ver. 9 means *where*, and is rendered by the Vulgate *ubi*.—In ver. 10 "known" is used in the sense of *regarded*.

Holy Ghost saith, To-day if ye
8 will hear his voice, harden not
your hearts, as in the provocation,
in the day of temptation in the
9 wilderness; when your fathers
tempted me, proved me, and saw

μερον, ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε,
μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς
ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν
τοῦ πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὗ ἐπείρα- 9
σάν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, ἐδοκίμασάν

---

11. The literal translation is, 'if they shall enter,' a threat equivalent to "they shall not enter." The *εἰ* corresponds with the particle אִם in Gen. xxi. 23.

It is important to ascertain in what sense the term *rest* is here employed. Such an inquiry will assist in forming a clear view of some portions of the next chapter.

The threat referred to is stated in Num. xiv. 23, 29, et seq., and it is, that the unbelieving race should perish in the desert, and not be permitted to enter the promised land. "They shall not see it;" their "carcasses shall fall in this wilderness;" there "they shall be consumed and there they shall die." This is the meaning of the threat which the Psalmist expresses in the terms, "they shall not enter into my *rest*." And in this sense the word *rest* is evidently used in Ex. xxxiii. 14, "My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee *rest*;" in Deut. iii. 20, "till the Lord have given *rest*;" xii. 9, 10, "Ye are not as yet come to the *rest* and to the *inheritance*, but when ye go over Jordan, and dwell in the land which the Lord giveth you to inherit, and he giveth you *rest* from all your enemies, so that ye dwell in safety;" Josh. i. 15, "The Lord have given your brethren *rest*, and they also have possessed the land." Comp. xxii. 4. In all these places, which plainly refer to settlement in the land of Canaan, the Greek is the same as here, except that sometimes the verb is used. Stuart seems to understand the rest spoken of in the Psalm exclusively of future rest in heaven. "*My rest* means such rest as I enjoy, or such rest as I have prepared or provided," ver. 11; and on ver. 18, he distinguishes between "the land, the good land," mentioned in Num. xiv. 23, Deut. i. 35, and the rest. "In neither case" (the two texts) "is the word *rest* employed. Exclusion from *the goodly land* necessarily implied exclusion from the heavenly Canaan also, or from *the rest of God*." But the texts above cited clearly prove that the settlement in the land of the promised inheritance is itself the rest spoken of.

But this is not all that the threat denounced in the desert and referred to by the Psalmist implies. As the promised land was an emblem of future rest and happiness in Christ's everlasting kingdom, such a denunciation, viewed in the light afforded by prophecy and other scriptural analogy, implies also that the Hebrews, if they continued unbelieving and impenitent, should be excluded from God's rest in heaven. In this view does the

10 με, καὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη. Διὸ προσώχθισα τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ καὶ εἶπον· ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ,
11 αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδούς μου· ὡς

my works forty years. Wherefore, 10 I was grieved with that generation, and said, They do always err in *their* heart, and they have not known my ways. So I sware in my wrath, 11

---

author of the epistle comment on the Psalm, availing himself of the threat denounced in the desert and the use of it made by David, to impress on the minds of Hebrew Christians the danger of unbelief and the fatal consequences which must result therefrom, namely the forfeiture of the enjoyment of divine rest in heaven.

If we regard the land of Canaan as a symbol or type of heaven, we shall be the better able to explain certain particulars which must otherwise involve some difficulty. Few readers of the sacred narrative can have perused the touching language of Moses when he laments his exclusion from the promised land, without deep emotion, accompanied by pity and regret at least, if not by a feeling somewhat stronger. "I must die in this land, I must not go over Jordan; but ye shall possess that good land." Deut. iv. 22. The aged and venerable man had in early life interested himself in behalf of his enslaved brethren, and preferred partaking of their affliction to enjoying the pleasures of the Egyptian court. Sent by God as their deliverer, he had pleaded their cause before Pharaoh, disregarding his indignation, being influenced by faith in the invisible One. He had conducted them out of the country; given them a code of divinely instituted laws, which, if not in all respects absolutely the very best, was the best which they could bear; spent the vigour of his life in their service; been subjected to all their ingratitude and rebellion, and distressed during forty years by the hardships necessarily attendant on so long a course of wandering in the Arabian desert. In a word, like Christ he had been "faithful to him who appointed him." And yet, because "he spake unadvisedly with his lips" when the people had "provoked his spirit," (Ps. cvi. 33,) failing in one instance to honour the Lord before the people through a want of faith and of exact obedience, (Num. xx. 8–12,) he is not suffered to enter the good land. He too, as well as the rebels, must die, and die near its borders, in the very view of its luxuriant plenty.

If now we consider the land of Canaan is a type of heaven, and keep in mind the general symbolical character of the whole Mosaic system, we shall be furnished with another reason for this divine procedure in addition to those expressly stated in the sacred volume. Doubtless it was to teach this most salutary and important lesson, that in the present fallen state of man the law cannot justify or sanctify or save. Moses stands as the representative of the system. He must not bring Israel into Canaan, because his system cannot bring a soul to heaven. A Joshua is needed to cast out

They shall not enter into my rest.
12 Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God.
13 But exhort one another daily, while it is called To-day; lest any of you

ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου. Βλέπετε, 12 *ἀδελφοί, μήποτε ἔσται ἔν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος, ἀλλὰ παρακαλεῖτε* 13 *ἑαυτοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, ἄχρις οὗ*

---

and destroy the enemy and to establish the people in their place, and he is the symbol of Jesus, the Saviour of men and the conqueror of their most deadly foes. If the reader will carefully attend to the similar use made by St. Paul in Gal. iv. 21–31, of certain facts in the history of Abraham, he will be the more inclined to admit the probability of what has just been said. In connection with this subject, I refer him to my Companion to the Book of Genesis, note 90, pp. 284, 285.

As settlement in the land of Canaan, each tribe and family in its own divinely appointed *inheritance*, is typical of the permanent enjoyment of blessings in Messiah's kingdom, we need not be surprised that the phrases, *to possess* or *inherit the land, to dwell in it for ever*, and others of the same sort, are often employed by the prophets to denote perpetuity of rest and happiness in Christ's kingdom, whether as begun on earth or as continued everlastingly in heaven. Certain it is, that such language often occurs in connections which will not justify a limitation of the meaning to a permanent residence of the Hebrew nation in the land of Palestine. This is acknowledged by some of the most learned and judicious of the Hebrew writers themselves. I have given some illustrations of this in my book on the Jewish Rabbies, to which I must refer. See pp. 42, 43. What is said either here or there is not necessarily at variance with the opinion of the future restoration of the Jews to their own land, although with regard to many prophetic passages which are supposed to sustain this opinion, it may serve to sanction a different interpretation. Certainly such a restoration cannot possibly exhaust the full meaning of such passages.

12. "An evil heart of unbelief:" Either a heart made evil by unbelief and the recklessness which it occasions; or an unbelieving, wicked heart. The infidelity shows itself in the apostasy from God immediately afterwards mentioned.

13. "While it is called to-day:" That is, while the language of the Psalm is applicable, which is equivalent to saying, while opportunity of repentance and faith is afforded; which is always represented in Scripture as the present time.

14. Γεγόναμεν expresses the past act of having become partakers of Christ and its continuance, and may be paraphrased thus, 'we continue to be.' "The beginning of our confidence;" that is, our early confidence on our conversion to the Gospel.

τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται, ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ 14 *τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας· μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν, ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως* 15 *μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν· ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι· σήμερον, ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ.* 16 *Τίνες γὰρ ἀκούσαντες παρεπίκραναν; ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπ-* 17 *του διὰ Μωϋσέως; Τίσι δὲ προσώχθισε τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη; οὐχὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήσασιν, ὧν τὰ κῶλα ἔπεσεν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ;* 18 *Τίσι δὲ ὤμοσε μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἀπειθή-* 19 *σασι; Καὶ βλέπομεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν εἰσελθεῖν δι' ἀπιστίαν.*

be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin; (for we are made par- 14 takers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end;) while it is said, 15 To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation. For some, when they 16 had heard, did provoke; howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he 17 grieved forty years? *was it* not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness. And 18 to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that 19 they could not enter in because of unbelief.

---

15. Various constructions of this verse have been offered. The repetition of the quotation in ver. 7 which is introduced in the former half, has been thought to be followed in the latter by the author's own exhortation expressed in the words before quoted in ver. 8. The whole verse has been explained in close connection with the 14th. 'We are partakers of Christ, provided we hold fast &c., while it is said, to-day &c.' Another view connects it with ver. 16, thus: 'When the Psalmist refers to the threat of God in the desert, who were they that provoked him? Consider their condition, the favours they had received and the punishment they incurred. Your condition is in some respects similar, and may become so in others.' It may be granted that any one of these constructions affords a suitable sense. But I think the most natural is that which makes the 14th verse parenthetical, connecting the 13th and 15th thus: 'Exhort one another while opportunity offers, lest any one be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin,' in its being said to-day &c., that is, while such language is applicable.

16. The English translation, "some &c. howbeit not all" &c., is feeble and without point. To say that some Hebrews provoked God is a useless repetition of what had been said before; and the addition, "yet not all," when there were only two or three exceptions, is frigid. The best commentators are generally agreed that *τίνες* should be rendered *who*, and the clause be understood interrogatively. Ἀλλά may have the meaning of truly, indeed, as perhaps in Luke xvii. 8. The vast multitude of the rebels had no influence in producing immunity from the threat or its execution; neither will the extensiveness of an apostasy mitigate the severity of the punishment that must follow. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 5.

18. *Τοῖς ἀπειθήσασι* may be translated 'to the disobedient,' but its asso-

IV. Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left *us* of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to
2 come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them; but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard *it*.
3 For we which have believed do enter into rest; as he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they

Φοβηθῶμεν οὖν, μήποτε, καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, δοκῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ὑστερηκέναι. Καὶ γάρ ἐσμεν εὐηγγελισμένοι, καθάπερ κἀκεῖνοι· ἀλλ' οὐκ ὠφέλησεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνους, μὴ συγκεκερασμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν. Εἰσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν οἱ πιστεύσαντες, καθὼς εἴρηκεν· ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, εἰ

---

ciation with "unbelief" in the next verse, and with "faith" and "believers" in iv. 2, 3, are decisive in favour of our English version, "to them that believed not."

19. Καί, thus.

iv. The connection of this chapter with what precedes is so intimate, that one cannot but express both regret and surprise that a new one should have been commenced. The unfortunate division does not here, as it frequently does elsewhere, mar the sense, which is too perspicuous to be easily obscured.

1. His rest, that is God's rest in heaven, of which that in the promised land was a type. Δοκῇ is employed to soften the thought of failure. It is difficult if not impossible to translate it. It certainly does not denote a *seeming* to fail and not the *reality*. Perhaps it may be expressed in some such phrase as this: 'lest by some possibility any of you may after all forfeit this promised rest.'

2. 'For we too have glad tidings proclaimed to us as they also had.' The announcement to Christians here spoken of is, of course, that of the Gospel; that said to have been made to the ancient Hebrews is the promise of rest in Canaan, together with the thereby adumbrated eternal rest in heaven. And this is nothing less than the Gospel. The only difference between the two cases is, that in the one the promise is fuller and more distinct, and the grounds and causes and results of it more clearly developed than in the other. That the ancient patriarchs and other Hebrews looked beyond this world to a heavenly is plainly declared in Heb. xi. 10, 13–16.—"Word of hearing," that is, of the report; account which they heard. Comp. Rom. x. 16, 17, with Isa. liii. 1.

3. The author had just stated want of faith as the cause why the promise made to the Hebrews in the desert did not benefit them. This leads him to lay down a proposition of vast importance: "For we believers, (literally, who have believed,) do enter into the rest." He affirms the general principle, that faith has always been the condition attached to the enjoyment of God's rest. The pronoun *we* is not limited to persons of any

εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου· καίτοι τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσ-
4 *μου γενηθέντων.* Εἴρηκε *γάρ που περὶ τῆς ἑβδόμης οὕτω· καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάν-*
5 *των τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν· εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατά-*

shall enter into my rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he 4 spake in a certain place of the seventh *day* on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works. And in this *place* again, 5 If they shall enter into my rest.

---

particular period: it shows the association of those so designated with each other in one community. It may refer to ages past or future. In Deut. v. 24, "*we* have heard" and "*we* have seen" is used of the former generation, of whom very few were living at the time of the address. And the confession in xxvi. 6–9, is to be made by all subsequent generations, who in recognising the goodness of God to their ancestors, speak as if they were the individuals themselves to whom it had been extended. Zechariah, in addressing his contemporaries after the captivity, uses this language: "as *ye* fled in the days of Uzziah king of Judah," xiv. 5; which was several centuries before. The prospective use of such language appears in Eph. iv. 13: "until *we* all come to a perfect man" &c., referring to a state of Christian character and blessing still future. And this usage may be applied to illustrate 1 Thess. iv. 15, 17, where, "*we* who are alive" is equivalent to those of the Christian body who shall subsist upon earth at the time referred to. See Storr de sensu historico, § xxii. note 183. In striking analogy with the meaning of the expression in the text is the language of Clement of Rome in his admirable Epistle to the Corinthians, section 33, at the close: "We are not justified by ourselves, neither by our own wisdom, or knowledge, or piety, or the works which we have done in holiness of heart; *but by faith, by which Almighty God hath justified all men from the beginning.*"

The author certainly employs the word *rest* here to denote the heavenly inheritance. He now proceeds to show that this is the rest which "the Holy Ghost" has in view in the Psalm. The remarks that follow have been supposed to be intended to prove two points, first, that the rest intended by the Psalmist is not the sabbatical rest; neither secondly, is it the rest in the land of Canaan. But to enter upon an argument to establish the former point, seems a very gratuitous and unnecessary labour. It is inconceivable that any Hebrew could need evidence that a weekly rest, which his ancestors had been enjoying from time immemorial, was not that which the Psalmist exhorts him to endeavour to obtain; neither is it credible that the sacred writer would waste his time in such an attempt. The whole argument seems to be directed towards the latter point. That this is certainly the leading thought must be obvious to any one who carefully reads the following verses to the 10th. The precise bearing and in-

6 Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief: 7 Again, he limiteth a certain day, saying in David, To-day, after so long a time; (as it is said) To-day,

παυσίν μου. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολείπεται 6 τινὰς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτήν, καὶ οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες οὐκ εἰσῆλθον δι' ἀπείθειαν, πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν, 7 σήμερον, ἐν Δαυῒδ λέγων μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον (καθὼς προείρηται)· σήμερον,

---

tention of the latter half of the 3d is not very clear. If καίτοι be translated, *and indeed*, that is "*namely*," as Stuart contends, the passage may be paraphrased thus: 'Rest namely from (comp. the ellipsis of the preposition in Acts i. 4,) the works which were made at the creation;' that is, such rest as God himself is represented as enjoying in Gen. ii. 2, 3. Thus this portion of the verse and the next two verses may describe the nature of this divine rest, denoted by the Psalmist in the phrase "my rest." If the more usual meaning of καίτοι be followed, "and yet, nevertheless, although," we may adopt the view of Tholuck as expressed by Dr. Robinson under the word: "They shall not enter into my rest, the works nevertheless having been finished from the foundation of the world; that is, the reason why they did not enter into God's rest was not that this rest did not then exist, for it had existed from the foundation of the world, ver. 4. As *they* did not enter in, God ever renews his invitation."

6, 7. Ἀπολείπεται, remaineth: Peirce very justly remarks that this word is not to be understood in a logical sense equivalent to, *it follows;*' and this is evident from its use in ver. 9. It is *the rest* that remaineth, or *the promise* of the admission of believers into it, which is implied in the threat that unbelievers should not enter.

Commentators differ much respecting the construction of these verses. Some place 7–10 in a parenthesis, and connect the 6th and 11th. But the manifest logical inference drawn in the 9th is opposed to such a view.—Stuart supposes an ellipsis at the end of the verse, which he supplies thus: "It follows that believers only can enter in, (comp. ver. 3;) or rather, it follows that a rest remains for believers. Comp. ver. 9." But it is not at all probable that by omitting such an inference the writer would leave his sentence so imperfect. I consider the following construction as preferable to either. 'As the rest is reserved to be entered into, and the old unbelievers did not enter into that which God had promised them by Moses, the Spirit through David, long after the former threat had been verified by excluding the unbelieving race in the desert, marks out again a definite period, during which preparation might be made for the enjoyment of God's rest, and in which time of the offer of mercy and favour the people are exhorted not to become obdurate.' The repetition of some phrases is intended to impress the subject, and repetitions not dissimilar may be

ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ
8 σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. Εἰ γὰρ
αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν περὶ
9 ἄλλης ἐλάλει μετὰ ταῦτα ἡμέρας. Ἄρα
ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ τοῦ
10 θεοῦ. Ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν κατά-
παυσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς κατέπαυσεν
ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν
11 ἰδίων ὁ θεός. Σπουδάσωμεν οὖν εἰσελ-

if ye will hear his voice, harden not
your hearts. For if Jesus had given 8
them rest, then would he not after-
ward have spoken of another day.
There remaineth therefore a rest to 9
the people of God. For he that is 10
entered into his rest, he also hath
ceased from his own works, as God
did from his. Let us labour there- 11

---

found in the Rabbies. Thus one of Stuart's objections is removed: "This makes the sentence very much involved, and obscures the design of the writer." The sentence is somewhat involved, but the design is not at all obscured thereby. His other objection, that it cannot be "proved that the rest proffered in the Psalm still remains by merely showing that David spake of a definite time in which the offer of rest was *then* made," is of very little weight. The fact that David urges his nation to obedience that they may enter into rest, presumes the existence of a future rest after this life; and if such a rest existed in David's time, the Apostle may well assume its existence ever after. The general idea in the two verses is, that the Psalmist applies God's threat to the Hebrews in the desert as a motive to urge his contemporaries to faith and obedience, and warns them by that example not to slight their day of grace.

8. If settlement in the land of Canaan under the command of Joshua comprised the whole of what was meant by the promised rest, David would not have urged the necessity of employing the present period as a time of preparation for the enjoyment of such a rest. The words "another day" are intended to recall to the reader's mind the whole passage from the Psalm, somewhat like an imperfect quotation so common with the Rabbies, and of which we have some instances in the New Testament. See the note on Heb. xii. 27.—In Hebrew and Greek, Jesus and Joshua are the same name, meaning deliverer, Saviour, which may serve to explain the reason for the occurrence of the former in our version.

9. The conclusion here follows, namely, a sabbatical rest remains for God's people. The word here is σαββατισμὸς, which never elsewhere occurs in the Bible. It is formed from the verb which means 'to keep the feast of the Sabbath;' and is substituted for κατάπαυσις, which had been all along used before, and it indicates that the rest is one of holy quiet and satisfaction, such as God enjoyed on completing the works of creation.

10. The analogy is here carried out. The believer rests from his own labours, (Rev. xiv. 13,) as God also did from those which were properly his. Hence in the next verse it is described emphatically as "*that rest*."

12, 13. Many of the ancients and some distinguished writers also of modern times have understood the phrase "Word of God" here as meaning

fore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of 12 unbelief. For the word of God *is* quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and *is* a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. 13 Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things *are* naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.

θεῖν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν κατάπαυσιν, ἵνα μή ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι πέσῃ τῆς ἀπειθείας. Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ 12 καὶ ἐνεργής, καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον, καὶ διϊκνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν, καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας· καὶ 13 οὐκ ἔστι κτίσις ἀφανὴς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, πάντα δὲ γυμνὰ καὶ τετραχηλισμένα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος.

---

the divine Logos, the angel of Jehovah who brought the Israelites out of Egypt. (See a remarkable passage in Wisdom xviii. 15.) But this use of the term Logos is peculiar to St. John among the writers of the New Testament. The reference here is to God's revealed declaration, and, as the context shows, chiefly to his threatenings. According to most commentators there is a transition from the word to God himself, beginning with the last clause of ver. 12 or with ver. 13; and this is perfectly natural and easy. Tholuck, however, refers the whole to the "divine word," which he regards as personified and "designated as the representative of God, as Christ says in John xii. 48, 'The word that I have spoken, the same (Gr. *he* or *that*) shall judge him in the last day.'"—The declaration of God is described as living and powerful, its influence is permanent and energetic. This characteristic is represented under the figure of a sharp and piercing sword, penetrating into the man, and severing his various and inmost parts. Terms expressive of physical and spiritual being are employed in reference both to the figure and to the subject intended. In other words, the comparison and the thing compared both suggest the terms employed, and mutually run into each other. The general ideas are those of acute discrimination, deep penetration, accurate investigation, and terrific retribution. For the figure, see Isa. xlix. 2, Rev. i. 16, ii. 12.—The last clause of this verse has been rendered 'concerning whom we speak;' but this is frigid. The only meaning that agrees with the context is, 'with,' or 'to whom is our account.' The Greek word is used in the same sense in the parable of the unjust steward, Luke xvi. 2.

14–16. The connection of these verses is with the close of the first section, ii. 17, 18, and commencement of the second, iii. 1, 2, as is evident even from the use of the same or similar words. And hence arises an argument in favour of πεπειρασμένον rather than πεπειραμένον in ver. 15, as πειρασθεὶς and πειραζομένοις are the words before employed. In the

14 Ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας.
15 Οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν, πεπειρασμένον δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιό-
16 τητα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. Προσερχώμεθα οὖν μετὰ παῤῥησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος, ἵνα λάβωμεν ἔλεον καὶ χάριν εὕρωμεν εἰς εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν.
V. Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίστα-

Seeing then that we have a great 14 high-priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast *our* profession. For we 15 have not an high-priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as *we are, yet* without sin. Let us therefore come 16 boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.

For every high-priest taken from V. among men is ordained for men in

---

former portion the Apostle had mentioned Christ as the high-priest faithful and merciful. The same official dignity and characteristic disposition are here brought before us, as a motive to perseverance and fidelity in our Christian calling, and to confident prayer for heavenly assistance. The contents of i. 4–14 and iii. 1–4, which show Christ's superiority both to the angels and to Moses, illustrate the aptness of the expression, "*great* high-priest." It is impossible not to perceive that the author's mind naturally reverts to the priestly function of Christ as of the highest importance, and essential to the result of his mediatorial work. Any right view is opposed to the supposition, that, in representing our Lord as a priest or sacrifice, the writer merely accommodates to Jewish feelings and language.

"*Into* the heavens." The original requires the sense of *through*, and this is confirmed by other passages. Comp. vii. 26, ix. 11, 12, where see the note, and Eph. iv. 10. It is remarkable that although this sense had been suggested by Wiclif, whose version is "persed heuenes," none of the early English translators have followed it. The figure of God's gracious throne is thought by Stuart to refer "to the mercy-seat in the temple on which God is represented as sitting enthroned. There he heard the supplications of his people which were presented by the high-priest; there he accepted their oblations," &c. But, as the mercy-seat, that is, the golden cover of the ark, called also the propitiatory, (ἱλαστήριον,) was in the holy of holies into which the high-priest entered only once a year, it would be incongruous to represent it as the place from which prayer was habitually heard. The allusion most probably is to the figurative idea of God as a universal monarch seated on his throne, and thence dispensing his favours. See 1 Kings xxii. 19, Ps. xi. 4, xcvii. 2, Isa. lxvi. 1. The suppliant is encouraged to resort thither for mercy and grace for seasonable aid. The last words are a literal translation of the Greek.

v. 1–4. These and the following verses are a continuous portion of the train of thought begun in iv. 14, where the chapter should have commenced.

things *pertaining* to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices
2 for sins: Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with in-
3 firmity. And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for
4 himself, to offer for sins. And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as
5 *was* Aaron. So also Christ glorified

ται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, μετ- 2 *ριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περίκειται ἀσθένειαν· καὶ διὰ ταύτην ὀφείλει,* 3 *καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, οὕτω καὶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ προσφέρειν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν. Καὶ* 4 *οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμήν, ἀλλὰ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καθάπερ καὶ Ἀαρών. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς* 5 *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασε γενηθῆναι ἀρχιε-*

A high-priest is described as a man, selected from his brethren and appointed to act for them in relation to God, to offer in their behalf sacrifices for sin; one who is able to compassionate ignorant and erring persons, because he is himself pressed on all sides by sinful infirmity. On account of this infirmity, (διὰ ταύτην,) he is bound to offer for himself as well as for others. This dignified office no man may assume of his own accord; he alone can lay claim to it whom God calls, as was the case with Aaron. The author then makes his application of what he had said to Christ. Certainly there would be little relevancy or propriety in so doing, if Christ's priestly character and office were a mere figure to express dignity, and employed simply out of an accommodating courtesy to Jewish thought and usage.—"Gifts and sacrifices;" that is, oblations of various kinds. Θυσία, from θύω, to slay, although properly an animal sacrifice, is not thus restricted; as it is used to designate Cain's oblation of fruit in Gen. iv. 3, 5, and in a similar way elsewhere.—Ἀγνοοῦσι properly denotes such as sin through want of knowledge or consideration. But it ought not to be limited to this class of offenders. In ix. 7, the noun is used for sins in general, as is proved by the nature of the high-priest's action there narrated, and by vii. 27, where in reference to the same action the word employed is "sins" without any qualification.—Μετριοπαθεῖν, to be moderate or mild towards, to be indulgent, to compassionate.

5, 6. Whitby considers this language as a confirmation of his statement made on ii. 10, that Christ was consecrated to the priestly office by his sufferings. "Whence," says he, "it must follow that he could not exercise his sacerdotal function till after death; and this the Apostle showeth here by saying, he was made a high-priest by the Father, saying, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.'" The quotation he rightly explains of Christ's resurrection, referring for proof to Acts xiii. 33. Peirce also applies the passage in the same way, and even introduces the theory in his paraphrase of ver. 7: "Who, before he was constituted such a high-priest, even while he dwelt here on earth in flesh," &c. In his note he

ρέα, ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτόν· υἱός
6 μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε·
καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει· σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς
τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ.

not himself to be made an high-priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee. As he saith also in 6 another *place*, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.

---

remarks as follows:—"By these two verses the priesthood of Christ appears plainly to bear date after his resurrection; which is very contrary to the opinion which has been commonly received, that he was a priest and acted as such in his death." He acknowledges that this opinion has "some plausible argument to support it." It would occupy too much space to examine and refute all his alleged proofs in defence of his position. They may be set aside if we carefully consider, that the one sacrifice of Christ made by his voluntary offering of himself upon the cross is represented in the epistle as made available by his entrance into heaven, and there acting as our perpetual intercessory high-priest. The oblation may be said to have been begun on earth, and to be consummated in heaven, the whole action both here and there, constituting the one effectual and never to be repeated offering. That the reader may judge for himself of the character and value of Peirce's reasoning, I will transcribe a short portion. "The commencement of his priesthood is perpetually through this epistle reckoned to be at his resurrection, and going into heaven. So chap. iv. 14, vi. 20, vii. 23, (this reference is probably a mistake, as it is nothing to the purpose,) 26, viii. 1, ix. 11, 12, x. 10–12, 19–21." Not one of this array of texts says a word about "the commencement of his priesthood." He argues from viii. 4, "that Christ was not a priest on earth." But the meaning is evidently this, that a mere earthly priest was unnecessary, as the Mosaic succession supplied abundance. But Christ's priesthood was of another sort, and was exercised permanently in heaven. I omit other attempts to sustain his theory, as they are inferior to these if possible.

The meaning of the verses is self-evident. Christ did not constitute himself high-priest. He neither came nor spoke nor acted of himself, neither did he seek his own glory. John v. 36, 37, viii. 42, vii. 16, viii. 38, 40, v. 19, 20, 30, viii. 50, 54. He glorified him to become high-priest, who, by raising him from the dead (Rom. vi. 4,) "declared him to be the Son of God in power," (Rom. i. 4,) and who had long before announced him as an everlasting priest like Melchisedek. The point of the two verses is that God glorified Christ by honouring him with this most distinguished high-priesthood. The period of its commencement has nothing to do with the subject.

"Order." The original word may be thus translated, but if this be understood to mean *series* as of a course, it does not seem very apposite,

7 Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard 8 in that he feared; though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by 9 the things which he suffered: And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all 10 them that obey him; called of God an high-priest after the order of Melchisedec.

Ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων προσενέγκας καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, καίπερ ὢν υἱός, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν, καὶ τελειωθεὶς ἐγένετο πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου, προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ. 7 8 9 10

---

as the whole series is limited to two, the type and the antitype. It probably expresses rank, character, quality. The general idea of likeness is substituted by the author himself in viii. 15, and the Syriac version of the Psalm so translates the original Hebrew.

7–10. The antecedent of "who" is the prominent subject of discourse, Christ, and not the immediately preceding Melchisedek. "Heard in that he feared." The Greek bears two translations, either of which makes a good meaning. Ἐυλαβεία may signify *piety*, *religiousness of character*, and ἀπο be taken in the sense of *for*, *on account of*, as in Matt. xxviii. 4. The idea will then be that Christ was heard in his distress on account of his piety and holiness; pro sua reverentia: Vulg. Or, as the word is used for *fear* in general, (see Passow's Greek Lexicon,) it may here stand for the *object of fear*. Then *delivered* should be substituted for *heard*, and the meaning will be, delivered from what he feared. This could not be simply death, nor even the pains of crucifixion which were to precede it. It was rather that overwhelming horrour which bowed down the Redeemer's soul and made it "exceeding sorrowful." From this agonizing state of mind and feeling which had so powerful an influence on his physical frame, he was delivered, as is proved by his calmness and dignity of manner in all the subsequent scenes of his passion until his death. The particularity of the statement here made proves that the author was well acquainted with the agony in Gethsemane as related in the Gospels.—"A son." This does not accurately express the true sense of the original. The Greek, it is true, is without the article; but the word becomes definite from its connection and well known application, as in Matt. xii. 41, 42, "men of Nineveh" and "a queen of the south" necessarily recal to the minds of the hearers the generation and royal personage referred to. Here our English idiom allows the most literal translation and thereby gives the precise meaning: "though he were Son." The single word comprehends his whole dignity. The translations of Wiclif, Tyndale, and the Geneva, omit the article, but introduce

11 *Περὶ οὗ πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν, ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς.* 12 *Καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον, πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς, τίνα τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ; καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς.* 13 *Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος ἄπειρος λόγου*

11 Of whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing. 12 For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which *be* the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. 13 For every one that useth milk *is* unskilful in the word of righteousness; for he is a

---

God's, quite unnecessarily. "He learned obedience," that is, he experienced it. The submission itself made him fully comprehend what it was to obey. On "being made perfect," see the note on ii. 10.

11. The Apostle has several times brought before his reader in close connection the priesthood of Melchisedek and that of Christ. It is a subject which evidently occupies his mind, an engrossing theme on which he is preparing to concentrate his thoughts. His tongue is ready to break forth with the noble topic. But the proper moment has not yet fully come. The thoughts and feelings and spiritual conceptions of his readers must be yet further trained and disciplined. And therefore he proceeds as follows from this verse to the end of chapter sixth.

Περὶ ὃυ. It is of no consequence as regards the general sense, whether this be rendered 'concerning which,' that is the analogy of the priesthood of Christ to that of Melchisedek, or 'concerning whom,' meaning either of these personages. I should prefer the latter, understanding it of Christ, as the prominent and most important subject of discourse. The particular characteristic of Christ is, of course, his priesthood as analogous to that of Melchisedek.

'To speak of whom we have much discourse (or matter,) and hard to be explained.' The reason of the difficulty lies not so much in the nature of the subject as in the condition of the hearers: 'ye have become dull in hearing.' "Ye *are*" does not express the full meaning of the Greek. It is used also in the next verse, and in both it implies that they had declined from a former better Christian condition, which is alluded to in vi. 10, x. 32–35. If *ἀκοαῖς* expresses the instruments of hearing, as would seem to be favoured by the use of the plural, it must be taken by a figure for the sense itself.

12–14. If *τίνα* be connected with the preceding clause, the meaning will be '*that some one* teach you.' If with what follows, the words must be translated '*certain* elementary principles,' or, what (they are,) and some term to denote the teacher must be understood with *διδάσκειν*. The former is the simpler construction. "The oracles of God" are identical with

14 babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, *even* those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.

VI. Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward

δικαιοσύνης· νήπιος γάρ ἐστι. Τελείων 14 *δέ ἐστιν ἡ στερεὰ τροφή, τῶν διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ.*

Διὸ ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα, μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων καὶ πίσ- VI.

---

the "doctrine" of vi. 1, and the language in each place denotes the elementary principles of the Christian religion. The figures of milk and babes for instruction adapted to weak and imperfect disciples, and of strong food or meat and full grown men for that suitable for ripe and advanced Christians, is used by St. Paul in 1 Cor. iii. 2. The former figure, however, does not always imply a state of feebleness and ignorance, but is sometimes expressive of simplicity, humbleness and docility. See 1 Pet. ii. 1, 2.

"Word of righteousness:" either, the Christian doctrine of justification; or, more probably, the doctrine or system of righteousness, holiness, true religion. In each of these three verses, as in iv. 12, the comparison runs into the thing compared or intended to be illustrated. To have the senses so exercised as to enable one to discern good and evil, is expressive of maturity of mental growth, and is here employed to denote a practically sound, discriminating and advanced religious condition. See Gen. iii. 5, where the tempter promises a condition of knowledge and happiness very far beyond the uninformed state of mere children.

vi. 1–3. "Wherefore:" This may be connected with v. 11, thus: 'as I have much to say, let us, leaving the first principles, however important they may be, go on,' &c. Or, most probably, the connection is nearer, with vs. 13, 14; as if he had said, 'as every true disciple must wish to grow in grace and knowledge, and not to remain in the condition of weak and uninformed children,' &c.—"Perfection," that is, thorough Christian character, both as to knowledge and godliness.—"The foundation of repentance and faith." The genitives are exegetical, repentance and faith being themselves the foundation spoken of.—"Dead works;" that is, such as are deadly, destructive in their nature and result:—"Baptisms," *βαπτισμῶν*. As this word never occurs for Christian baptism, but for Jewish ablutions both in the Old and New Testaments, some have here explained it of such washings. But this is at variance with the context, which requires us to understand it of a Christian principle or institution, or at the very least to comprehend this as its principal meaning. There is the strongest probability that Christian baptism is meant. The word elsewhere employed is

2	τεως ἐπὶ θεόν, βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς, ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν, ἀναστάσεώς τε νεκρῶν	God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of	2
3	καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου. Καὶ τοῦτο ποιή-	resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgement. And this will	3

βάπτισμα, but βαπτισμός is equally proper in itself, and is used with βάπτισις for John's baptism by Josephus.* Why the plural is employed instead of the singular is not easy to say. By some, Jewish ablutions and Proselyte baptisms are thought to be comprehended in the meaning, although Christian baptism is most prominent. I can see no probability that the author intended any union of such merely external washings with fundamental principles of Christianity. Some have imagined the plural to be employed in reference to the practice of trine immersion. But this usage cannot be proved to have been so ancient, or sufficiently general to justify the supposition of such an allusion, and the baptism so performed was still one. Neither can the plural be explained in reference to the multitudes baptised, as Theodoret†, and after him some modern writers have supposed; for the rite itself, not the numbers submitting to it, is the subject. It has been suggested by Grotius, that the plural form is intended to intimate the twofold nature of baptism, both external and internal. But why then is such use confined to this passage? We might surely expect it where St. Peter defines baptism in his first epistle, iii. 21. Most probably it is used by way of distinction, to denote the superiority of the Christian rite to all outward Jewish cleansing, as the one sacrifice of Christ is expressed by the plural in ix. 23 for a similar reason.—"The laying on of hands" is confirmation, as is generally allowed and shown also by the context.—"Eternal judgment," that is, judgment of final and everlasting doom.—"And this we will do," ποιήσομεν. The future indicative is probably the true reading, and the writer doubtless expresses his intention to proceed by divine favour, beyond the elementary principles already mentioned, to a fuller and more perfect development of Christian doctrine. The subjunctive ποιήσωμεν, let us or may we do, though supported by some external authority, would be out of place in such an association.

4–6. The γάρ, *for*, has a logical connection with the former portion. The author expresses his determination to instruct them thoroughly in the nature of the Gospel, in order to guard them against apostasy, inasmuch as it is so dangerous a state, recovery from which in such circumstances is impossible.

In examining this portion, it is important to endeavour to determine the meaning of its several clauses. The direct bearing which it has on

* See Antiq. Lib. xviii. cap. vi. sect. 2, p. 805, Edit. Hud.

† In loc. Opera, tom. iii. p. 419.

4 we do, if God permit. For *it is* σομεν, ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ θεός. Ἀδύ- 4

some doctrinal points could not fail to exert an influence on its interpretation. This will appear in what follows.

"Enlightened:" "Were once lyghted:" Cranmer; and in x. 32, "had receaved lyght." So the Geneva translation, using the word "lightened;" and to the same purpose the other old English translations. The use of this word elsewhere as applied to Christians shows the meaning to be, properly instructed in the true nature of the Gospel; and this not solely intellectually and theoretically by merely human teaching, but also spiritually and practically by the accompanying agency of the Holy Spirit. Thus in John i. 9, Christ is said to "light every man," where nothing less than a real religious illumination as beaming from him "the true light" and offered to all, can possibly be intended. He is said to enlighten every man, because it is the nature and tendency of his Gospel so to do, as in Rom. ii. 4, God's goodness is said to "lead to repentance." In Eph. i. 18 and iii. 9, the object both of the Apostle's prayer and of the ministerial grace given to him, cannot be limited to any illumination less thorough. The noun is also used in the same broad sense of religious mental illumination in 2 Cor. iv. 4–6. In the Septuagint also and the version of Aquila, the Hebrew word *to teach* is often rendered by the Greek term employed in the epistle. See Schleusner's Thesaurus Vet. Test. sub voce, and Drusius in loc. This may therefore be regarded as the meaning of the word, as settled by scriptural usage, both here and in x. 32.

Another view, however, seemingly more limited, but no doubt originally intended to comprehend or imply this, claims very high antiquity. The venerable Syriac version translates here, "gone down to baptism," and in x. 32, "ye received baptism." The date of this version is somewhat uncertain, but most late critics agree that it is as old as the second century. Michaelis in his Introduction* has advanced some considerations to show that the Syriac Hebrews may not be quite so ancient as the other books of that translation. In his exposition of the epistle, however, he retracts this opinion.† The remarkable fact that the word *cumro* always occurs in Hebrew as the translation of *priest*, and never elsewhere in the New Testament in any form except in Acts xiv. 13 (in Syr. 12,) and xix. 35, where it is used of an idolatrous priest and service, while *cohen* is the term elsewhere and very frequently employed, seems to indicate not only a different translator, but also a different period when the respective words were in most general use. This difference cannot possibly have been owing merely to an incidental selection of one of two words equally well known and commonly used, for it occurs in the Hebrews thirty times.

* Bishop Marsh's Translation, vol. ii. part i. chap. vii. sect. 2, p. 5 et seq.

† Erklaerung des Briefes an die Hebraeer, 1762, p. 190.

νατον γάρ, τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γεν-	impossible for those who were once

---

Several of the fathers of the 4th century and afterwards follow the Syriac translation. Thus THEODORET: "who have come to all holy baptism;"* and probably CHRYSOSTOM, though he is not very clear;† also THEOPHYLACT, who speaks of the impossibility of receiving baptism again.‡ In the same way it is applied by Epiphanius.§ I cannot find this exposition of the texts in Hebrews in JUSTIN MARTYR, IRENÆUS, or CYPRIAN. TERTULLIAN quotes the former text at length but gives no exposition.‖ CLEMENT of Alexandria cites the latter in close connection with what he is saying about Christian knowledge, but without any reference to baptism.¶ ORIGEN quotes the passage from the sixth chapter, but says not a word about baptism. He quotes it also in reference to receiving the Holy Spirit, but without speaking of baptism. And again he quotes it, without any mention of baptism, although immediately afterwards he quotes largely the texts that do bear on this sacrament; and in a subsequent work, he quotes it again without any allusion to baptism.** The conclusion seems to be, that these early writers either did not know or choose to sanction this translation of the word.

The use of the term *illumination* for baptism is certainly very ancient. Justin Martyr is the first writer in whom it is found, but he employs it in such a way as shows, that about the year 140 when he is said to have written his first Apology,†† in which it occurs, it was in common use. The place is particularly worthy of notice, because it shows also the reason why this word was applied to baptism. Justin is giving an account of Christianity and speaking of a convert to the faith. He mentions him as baptized and regenerated. "This laver is called illumination, inasmuch as they who *learn* these things," that is, the truth of the Gospel, "are *illuminated in mind.*" Attempts have been made to alter the text of Justin, so as to make him speak a different language. But the common reading is authentic, and there is no good authority for any other. Some illumination preceded baptism, which was its seal and consummation, and presumed all who thereby publicly professed Christianity to have been already in some degree instructed in its truths, and in some degree enlightened by the Holy Spirit. The usage is somewhat analogous to that of *covenant* for *circumcision*. Justin proceeds thus: "And moreover, in the name of Jesus Christ who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Spirit who by the prophets announced before all things relating to Christ,

* Opera, tom. iii. p. 419. † Opera, Edit. Bened. tom. xii. p. 95. ‡ Opera, tom. ii. p. 683.

§ Adv. Hær. Lib. ii. Hær. xxxix. or lix., against the Cathari; Edit. Petav. Paris. 1622. p. 494.

‖ De Pudicitia, xx. p. 582, Opera, Edit. Rigalt. Paris. 1675.

¶ Stromata, iv. p. 514, Opera, Edit. Sylburg.

** Opera, Edit. Bened. Paris. 1738, tom. i. p. 378, 388, 560, iii. 207.

†† Cave, Historia Literaria, Oxon. 1740, vol. i. p. 61, 62.

enlightened, and have tasted of the σαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου

---

the illuminated person is washed." It is evident that he regards the former condition as preceding the latter. Afterwards he speaks of the baptized party as brought where the Christian community is assembled together, "who offer fervently common prayers both for themselves and for *the illuminated* person* and for all men every where."†

In the Sibylline Oracles, which is generally regarded as a pious fraud of the second century, the phrase ὕδασι φωτίζεσθαι, *to be enlightened by waters*, occurs in reference to John's baptism.‡ Clement of Alexandria mentions several names which were applied to baptism, and among them "illumination by which the holy and saving light is perceived." There is no doubt that illumination was considered as in part a pre-requisite of baptism, and in part as given or pledged in the sacrament itself, and continually communicated to the Christian. This may serve to explain his language; "being baptized, we are illuminated; being illuminated, we are adopted; being adopted, we are made perfect; being made perfect, we are rendered immortal."§ In the Apostolical Constitutions the "illuminated" are distinguished from "the faithful," who are called on to pray earnestly for them that they may be initiated into the death of Christ, and numbered among the saved in his holy church. It is plain that the writer refers to candidates for baptism. His annotator remarks, that in Cyril of Jerusalem, the illuminated are distinguished from catechumens, those already baptized, and the faithful; and that the name is applied to those who are *coming to* baptism. To the same purpose Zonaras, "they who are *preparing* for illumination" or "baptism," and in the Euchology or Greek Ritual.‖

Among other passages from the Greek fathers Suicer quotes the following, which are especially worthy of notice.¶ "Maximus (in his scholia) on the 3d chapter of the book on the celestial hierarchy, (ascribed to) Dionysius the Areopagite, p. 14, says: Observe that illumination precedes

* In the Oxford Tract, entitled Records of the Church, No. xiii. which contains a portion of Justin's account, the translation is, "who is *now* illuminated." The Greek has nothing corresponding to *now;* it is simply τοῦ φωτισθέντος, and the introduction of such a particle might give the impression that Justin meant to connect in point of time the baptism and the illumination. A trifling addition inadvertently made to an original text may give such a colouring to the expression as shall very materially alter the writer's meaning. Thus, Archbishop Wake, in his translation of the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp has "one of which," namely of the elect, "this great martyr, *most certainly* was;" (Apostolical Fathers, New York, 1810, sect. 16, p. 247;) and Milner, in his History, translates the same passage, "was *doubtless* one:" (Boston and Philadelphia Edition, cent. i. chap. v. p. 215.) The italicised words are not in the Greek, and might easily lead to a misapprehension of the original author's idea.

† Justin, Edit. Thirlby, Lond. 1722, pp. 90, 91, 95.

‡ Sibyll. Orac. lib. i. in Biblioth. Max. Vet. Pat. tom. viii. p. 12, Edit. De la Bigne, Paris. 1624.

§ Pædag. lib. i. cap. vi. p. 93. Comp. also what he says of illumination in p. 95.

‖ Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. vii. in Coteler. Pat. Apost. Edit. Le Clerc, Antwerp. 1700, vol. i. p. 394.

¶ Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, Amstel. 1728, tom. ii. col. 1492, 1493.

καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος heavenly gift, and were made par-

---

baptism, *τὸ φώτισμα πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος.* Chrysostom says, "The heretics have baptism, but not illumination, and they are baptized indeed in body, but are not enlightened in soul; for as also Simon was baptized, but not enlightened, so are they found in the same condition."*

The attention of the reader is requested to some remarks of Cardinal Hugo on these verses. "Those who have been once enlightened: in mind, by distinguishing between good and evil, so as not to call good evil and darkness light. Eph. v., ye were sometime darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord. Isa. lviii., he will fill my soul with splendours,† that is, with faith and virtues to enlighten it, and not only to enlighten the mind, but to recruit and delight the affections. Therefore he adds, have tasted," &c. After briefly remarking that the tasting refers to different states as of childhood, probation, perfection, he explains, "tasted of the heavenly gift," by, "have obtained remission of sins in baptism." Afterwards he says: "The first taste is in the remission of sins, the second in the performance of good works, the third in the contemplation of celestial things. And have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost; that is, the assisting grace of the Holy Spirit, enabling them to perform good works.—Again to be renewed, that is, to be again baptized, to become by baptism new persons." And yet afterwards he says: "To be restored again to their former condition, so as to become like virgins after a fall." He explains *impossible* by *difficult*.—The internal divine life is evidently the author's leading idea, and he connects it with the sacrament of baptism. Just so in his comment on John vi., the spiritual reception of Christ by faith is the principal thought, which in like manner he associates with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.‡

Whitby contents himself with an ipse dixit. "Once enlightened (in baptism.) It is very probable that this phrase obtained from the beginning of Christianity, and so this answers to the doctrine of baptisms, ver. 2." And on x. 32: "illuminated, that is, baptized into the Christian faith."—Hammond is not very clear and hardly consistent with himself. For "enlightened," he substitutes "have been received into the church by baptism;" and says in his note, "those that have been enlightened, that

* This passage, although usually printed in the editions of Chrysostom, is ascribed to an unknown author. It occurs in the 116th Homily, Op. tom. xii. p. 418 E. The Benedictine editor considers the homily to have been delivered at Constantinople in the latter part of the 4th century, and towards the end of the episcopate of Gregory Nazianzen. The statement which it contains is important and true, although the language is not consistent with what Chrysostom says of Simon in his homily addressed to the newly illuminated, tom. iii. p. 58.

† The quotation agrees with the Vulgate, except in the word *my* and the tense of the verb: implebit splendoribus animam tuam. The English translation, more in accordance with the Hebrew, is "thine health shall spring forth speedily."

‡ See my Essay on our Lord's discourse at Capernaum, Appendix, pp. 154, 155.

5 takers of the Holy Ghost, and *ἁγίου καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ* 5

certainly signifies baptism, which among the ancients was generally called illumination." And yet the same word in x. 32 he paraphrases thus: "You did first receive the faith," referring to Rom. xiii. 11, where he uses the same phrase for "believed."

Of these two leading expositions, I think there can be little doubt of the former being that intended by the author of the Hebrews. But either of them must imply the fact expressed by the other. If the Christians here described had been baptized, doubtless both before and after baptism their minds had been enlightened in the saving truths of Christianity; and if they had formerly become so enlightened, it cannot be doubted that they had avowed their faith by publicly professing Christ in that sacrament.

"Have tasted of the heavenly gift and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost." The figure of tasting, which seems to flow naturally from that employed in v. 13, 14, expresses satisfaction, enjoyment, springing from free participation. Any feebler sense is precluded by the context, and in this sense the word is repeatedly used. It is sufficient to cite one passage in St. Peter which is quoted from the Psalms: "If ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious," 1 Pet. ii. 3. Ps. xxxiv. 8, (Sept. xxxiii. 9.) "The heavenly gift" and "the Holy Ghost" are probably equivalent, the latter clause being exegetical of the former. Thus the *gift* will be identical with that mentioned by our Lord in his discourse to the Samaritan woman, which he explains by calling it "the living water which he would *give*," that is, according to a very frequent use of the figurative term *water*, the Holy Spirit. See John iv. 10, 14, and vii. 37–39. The participation of the Spirit here mentioned is certainly intended of his ordinary influences, as it is the state of a Christian which is being described; but as in that age his miraculous gifts were frequently dispensed, these may also in part be here comprehended. The mention of receiving the gifts and graces of the Spirit after baptism is in harmony with what we read in other places. See Acts ii. 38, viii. 15–17, xix. 5, 6. This may seem to favour that interpretation which explains "enlightened" of baptism, and this, it may also be said, is in harmony with the arrangement in ver. 2. Still, without any such limitation of meaning, the language is perfectly natural, as the enjoyments communicated by the Spirit are intimately associated with a Christian state of religious and spiritual knowledge.

"Tasted the good word of God:" that is, enjoyed the fulfilment in some degree of the gracious promises made by God in the Gospel, with the anticipation of their entire accomplishment hereafter. In a similar sense God's word or the thing that he hath promised is used in Josh. xxi. 45, xxiii. 14, 15, Jer. xxix. 10, xxxiii. 14. In the first two, the Septuagint has ἀγαθόν, and in the others καλόν.—"The world to come" is a Jewish

6 ῥῆμα, δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ have tasted the good word of God,

---

phrase for Messiah's age or world or kingdom, in contradistinction to that which preceded it. It is equivalent to the Gospel dispensation as begun here and continued perpetually hereafter. "The powers" of it are its energetic influences and appliances. These may be ordinary or extraordinary; and as the context contains nothing to limit the application, but rather the contrary, it is best to comprehend both.

"If they shall fall away:" So Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva Translation. Diodati also, se caggiono. It is unnecessary to trace the origin of this rendering. The literal meaning of the Greek is, *and having fallen away;* and to this purpose the Vulgate, et prolapsi sunt, and so Wiclif and the Rheims' translation: "and ben sliden fer awei—and are fallen." The persons before described are most undoubtedly spoken of as falling away, apostatizing from the grace and profession of the Gospel. Comp. xii. 15, "fail of (from) the grace of God;" also Gal. v. 4, "ye are *fallen* from grace," where the same verb is used as here, only compounded with a different preposition. Whether the apostasy in view be to Judaism, or Heathenism, or any erroneous system of philosophy contrary to Christianity, or to universal infidelity, is of little consequence. The effect is the same. It is impossible, at least in the ordinary condition of the divine arrangement in the Gospel scheme, to renew them again to a state of repentance. They cannot be brought back to their former Christian condition. And the reason follows, "they crucify again the Son of God." The dignity of the person so unworthily used is expressed by the appellation. Ἀνασταυρόω never elsewhere occurs in the New Testament, the word for crucify being always written without the preposition. It is best, therefore, with Chrysostom and other ancient authorities, to translate it with *afresh* or *again.* The Vulgate has *rursum.* The meaning is, that such persons are under the control of the same wicked and diabolical temper which demanded Christ's cruel and disgraceful death. They do in heart and soul what the murderers did in act. It is the same state of mind, and consequently in the sight of God the same guilt. "To themselves:" that is probably to their own ruin; though the pronoun may be redundant here, as it frequently is. "Put him to an open shame:" the disgrace attendant on the punishment of crucifixion seems to have suggested the word; the public contempt thrown upon religion by apostates is the idea.

The three verses just commented on appear to me to describe a true Christian condition and character, and to recognise the danger and of course the possibility of falling therefrom irrecoverably. Regarding them in candour and conscience, I cannot come to any other conclusion. The phraseology in vs. 4, 5, is strong and definite, and it will not be easy to say what language may describe a truly religious state, if this does not. The suppo-

and the powers of the world to come, 6 if they shall fall away, to renew

παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς

---

sition of falling in the 6th verse is put as a case not unlikely to happen, and which the writer most earnestly strives to guard against. To try to explain it as hypothetical is to abuse the science of interpretation, and to distort the plain meaning of Scripture. It is not to be wondered at that the advocates of a doctrinal system which denies that a real Christian can so fall, should have felt a difficulty in this passage. This may serve to account for certain modifying phraseology to be found in many expositors of this class. I shall quote briefly from two or three writers, who deservedly rank among the most distinguished.

The learned, devout, and candid Doddridge expresses himself as follows: "I see no necessity for extending in this place the energy of the Spirit beyond his *extraordinary* gifts. Bishop Hopkins quotes Acts viii. 15, which he thinks must include Simon Magus, as a proof, that *unregenerate* men might receive the Holy Ghost." It is not easy to see the bearing of this remark, unless it implies that the Hebrews referred to were also *unregenerate*. He paraphrases thus: "Have tasted by *some* impressions on their minds the efficacy of the good word of God, and felt *something* of the powers of the world to come, awakening in them *some* desires after holiness, &c. If such persons totally fall away from Christianity, it is impossible again to renew the *good impressions* made on them," &c. He restricts "the energy of the Spirit" to "extraordinary gifts,"* remarking however, that if the clauses—"heavenly gift, partakers of the Holy Ghost" are explained of "remission of sin, and sanctifying power and influence," it must be observed that the Apostle, in thus giving judgment upon the case, if it should happen, *does not declare that it actually does.*" The same feeling qualifies his language in the "improvement." "Let us not rest in any enlightening we may have received, in any taste we may have had, &c., nor in any operation of the Spirit upon our minds, *to form them to the most splendid talents and qualify us for the most pompous external services. Men may have all these and fall away*," &c. It is strange that such a man as Doddridge should not have paused to ask himself whether *such talents and qualifications* can possibly have come within the range of character intended by the Apostle's description! And equally strange is it that a writer usually so candid, should have retained in his paraphrase and note, the erroneous translation, "if they fall away," without an intimation that the original required a very different one.

* The language of McLean is similar: "Have tasted of the heavenly gift, *some influence of the Spirit accompanying the word*, and have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost *in his supernatural gifts, such as prophecy, discerning of spirits, several kinds of tongues*," &c. See Paraphrase and Commentary on the Hebrews by Archibald McLean, in two volumes, 8vo, Lond. 1820, vol. i. p. 180.

μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν them again unto repentance; seeing

---

The same impression is made upon the mind, but in a still stronger degree, by reading some remarks of the celebrated Dr. Dwight on these verses.* He does not scruple to say that "the Apostle himself has decided that the persons meant are not Christians. Their character is fully expressed in the 8th verse, under the image of the earth which beareth thorns and briers, while that of Christians is expressed in the 7th, under the image of the earth which bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed. These are here studiously contrasted. The character of the former is, therefore, exhibited as a direct contrast to that of Christians, who are represented every where as bringing forth good fruit." I might leave this very extraordinary passage without remark, as it bears on its face such an utter want of exegetical analysis. The first part of the figurative language might with vastly greater propriety be said to represent the state of these persons after having fallen away, and the latter their previous Christian character. To assume that the former part is parallel with their character as described in the 4th and 5th verses is preposterous, and yet this is necessary in order to support the position he sets out with, that "the Apostle himself has decided that they are not Christians."

"Secondly, it is not asserted by the Apostle, that those of whom he speaks ever actually fall away. The case is stated only in the form of a supposition, and he declares only that, should they fall away, there is no possibility of renewing them unto repentance. "Whether such persons do in fact fall away is, therefore, left uncertain." Most assuredly, if the persons spoken of were not true Christians, but such as are fitly described under the figure of ground producing briers and thorns, it were absurd to speak of their defection. The question is well put by Professor Stuart, "Defection from what?" And he gives the only answer that such a theory allows, "From a graceless condition and from a state of hypocrisy." Certainly it was quite unnecessary for Dr. Dwight to resort to a supposed case and to the English erroneous translation, in order to vindicate the text from any thing like an assertion of apostasy in the case of such persons. His attempt to do so prompts the suspicion that he could not entirely free his mind from the impression that, after all, the Apostle does mean real Christians. Even Calvin, although he endeavours to obviate the objections to his system which the whole passage suggests, does not hesitate to say that these words "mark a thorough defection *from the Gospel*:" Apostolus notat universalem ab Evangelio defectionem."†

* Theology; by Timothy Dwight, S. T. D., LL. D., late President of Yale College. Middletown, 1818, Serm. lxxxvii. vol. iii. p. 259.

† Commentarii in omnes epistolas S. Pauli, &c., in loc. Amstel. 1668.

they crucify to themselves the Son υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.

Dr. Gray, in his dissertation on the Priesthood of Melchisedek,* also attempts to weaken the natural impression of the Apostle's representation. "Those unhappy persons had been enlightened in the doctrine of salvation by Jesus; they had tasted the good word of God, *having been convinced of the truth of the Gospel, and induced to adopt its profession*, and the powers of the world to come, or *the miraculous powers of Messiah's earthly kingdom.*" In a note he remarks as follows: "This passage of Scripture and that other, chap. x. 29, have nothing to do with the question whether a regenerated person may fall from a state of grace. The question to which these passages relate is this: whether a person *who has heard the Gospel*, and has been enlightened by the Spirit of God *to perceive its truth and adopt it with joy*, may after all renounce the whole system of divine truth, and spurn the idea of salvation by the blood of Jesus." But the careful inquirer into truth, who is not under the controlling influence of a preconceived system, will not take an assertion for proof; nor is he likely to be satisfied with so meagre an interpretation of the Apostle's language as the italicised phrases express. With the words "adopt it with joy," compare Matt. xiii. 20, to which the writer seems to allude.

The Calvinistic divines have adopted the only advisable course consistent with their theory. If the doctrine of the indefectibility of grace be scriptural, consistency requires its advocates to deny that this and all other similar places of scripture can relate to the truly religious. The system demands some such exposition as the quotations above given contain. But there are divines who maintain this particular tenet, and yet explain this passage according to the natural sense of the words, and both admit and contend that the Apostle refers to "sincere Christians, persons truly converted and born again and true children of God," and that his "language describes the successive steps by which a true Christian advances to the *highest stage of Christian experience.*" I quote from the work of the Rev. Albert Barnes,† who has given a very candid and satisfactory exposition of the several clauses. He allows, too, that the words translated, "if they shall fall away," literally mean, having fallen away.—Such is the sense which would strike the great mass of readers. Unless there were some theory to defend, they would consider the expressions as describing true Christians. The connection demands such an interpretation. The object was not to keep those who were awakened and enlightened from apostasy, but to preserve those who were already in the church of Christ

* A Dissertation on the coincidence between the Priesthoods of Jesus Christ and Melchisedek. By JAMES GRAY, D.D. Phil. 1810.—A new edition of this Treatise has just been published by Carter & Brothers, New York.

† Notes, explanatory and practical, on the Epistle to the Hebrews.

7 Γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιοῦσα τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς πολλά- of God afresh, and put *him* to an

---

from going back to perdition. The kind of exhortation appropriate to those who were awakened and convicted but not truly converted, would be *to become converted;* not to warn them of the danger of *falling away.*" Still he does not regard the passage as opposed to the tenet in question. "It is not an affirmation that any *had* actually fallen away, or that in fact they *would* do it; but the statement is, that *on the supposition that they had fallen away*, it would be impossible to renew them again." This he repeats, adding, "A statement may be made of what *would* occur on the supposition that a certain thing should take place, and yet it be morally certain that the event never would happen. The passage *proves* that if true Christians should apostatize, it would be impossible to renew and save them. If then it be asked what was the *use* of a warning like this, I answer it would show the great *sin* of apostasy from God if it were to occur. It might be one of the most effectual means of preserving from apostasy. To state that a fall from a precipice would cause certain death, would be one of the most certain means of preserving one from falling:" &c.

Such a mode of reasoning appears to me wholly unsatisfactory. The object of the Apostle is to prevent the actual falling away of the persons whom he describes as real Christians, and with this view he sets before them the horrours of a state of apostasy. It is incredible that he should feel and show such concern to prevent what he knew could not occur. Such "*a statement*" as the author supposes might indeed be made, but such *a moral motive* could not be presented by an inspired or judicious man to free moral agents. It were preposterous to offer motives in order to dissuade creatures from falling over a precipice who were physically in a condition which made such a fall impossible. A similar remark applies to all Dr. Barnes's analogies. And as to the *use* of such a warning, it may well be asked, what practical good effect can result from showing the greatness of a merely hypothetical sin, which can never possibly occur? And surely there are real sins enough to warn men against, without denouncing threats against such as are merely supposable. The author says that no one would have thought of explaining the clause of any but true Christians but for the influence of a theory. The same remark is equally true of the reasons assigned for the "statement." They owe their existence to the same theory. With equal consistency the Universalist might allow the doctrine of future and eternal punishment to be revealed, and yet regard the representation as made simply in order to deter men from sinning.

Neither can it be said that the Apostle is only arguing with the Hebrews on their own admission, that he employs merely the *argumentum ad hominem.* For if the doctrinal theory in view be the true Christian one, the persons addressed cannot be presumed to have held any other. and therefore could not

7 open shame. For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, 8 receiveth blessing from God: But that which beareth thorns and briers *is* rejected, and *is* nigh unto cursing;

κις ἐρχόμενον ὑετὸν καὶ τίκτουσα βοτάνην εὔθετον ἐκείνοις, δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται, μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐκφέρουσα δὲ ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβό- 8 *λους ἀδόκιμος καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς, ἧς τὸ*

---

be reasoned with on such a presumption. The plain truth seems to be, that the author of the epistle considered the persons whom he was addressing, although true Christians, as in imminent danger of falling away, and therefore employs every effort within his power to prevent such a lamentable issue.

This whole passage of the epistle is strikingly parallel with that in x. 26–31. The expression there, "after having received the knowledge of the truth," is equivalent to "once enlightened," and confirms the view of that term above given. The "treading under foot the Son of God" of the one. is similar to the "crucifying afresh" of the other; and the "sinning wilfully" in the latter passage corresponds with the apostasy of the former.

7, 8. This figurative language graphically depicts the condition of true Christians who improve the blessings given them so as to advance their own moral and religious character and that of others; and also the state of apostates, increasing their own evil tendencies and passions, injuring others by the influence of their pernicious example, and exposing themselves to God's righteous indignation. Δι' οὓς, *on account of* the proprietors of the soil, according to the common usage of the preposition with an accusative. Blessing and cursing as applied to the ground is illustrated by Gen. xxvii. 27, iii. 17. "*Nigh* unto cursing:" He might have said *is cursed*, but as he wished the Hebrews to make the application to themselves so far as was suitable, he delicately introduces this form of expression to soften the apparent harshness.—"To be burned:" literally, *for* burning, by a usual Hebraism, the ל being represented by εἰς.

9–12. Tholuck very truly remarks here that the gentleness and kindness which mark this passage and x. 32 et seq., are similar to what we constantly meet with in St. Paul, especially in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, and in Gal. iv. 12, 19.—The best ancient authorities omit τοῦ κόπου, labour. The author earnestly wishes that every one whom he addresses should exhibit the same zeal, so as to acquire and maintain a full assurance of Christian hope even unto the end of life, thus imitating the example of those worthies in all ages, who, by steady dependence on God, and by patience in trials and perseverance in duty, obtained at last the promised inheritance. "The promises" are evidently put for the blessings promised. As the Apostle employs the present tense, there is not sufficient reason to limit to any preceding age the class of persons whom he referred to for imitation.

9 τέλος εἰς καῦσιν. Πεπείσμεθα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀγαπητοί, τὰ κρείττονα καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας, εἰ καὶ οὕτω λαλοῦ-
10 μεν. Οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεός, ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης, ἧς ἐνεδείξασθε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες.
11 Ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δέ, ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἄχρι τέλους,
12 ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε, μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρο-
13 νομούντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. Τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὁ θεός, ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐδενὸς εἶχε μείζονος ὀμόσαι, ὤμοσε
14 καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, λέγων· ἦ μὴν εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ σε·
15 καὶ οὕτω μακροθυμήσας ἐπέτυχε τῆς
16 ἐπαγγελίας. Ἄνθρωποι μὲν γὰρ κατὰ

whose end *is* to be burned. But, 9 beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak. For God *is* not unrighteous 10 to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have shewed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister. And 11 we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end; that ye be not slothful but fol- 12 lowers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises. For when God made promise to 13 Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless 14 thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. And so, after he had 15 patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by 16

13–18. "Blessing I will bless," &c. The repetition denotes intensity and is equivalent to, I will certainly or abundantly bless.—"Obtained the promise:" that is, what had been repeatedly promised, a son in his old age, whose birth was a pledge of future blessings to be bestowed on Abraham and his posterity both in this world and in the next. With the eulogy here given to Abraham's persevering faith, compare Rom. iv. 18–21.—"An oath," &c. It is the very nature and intention of an oath to confirm, and thus it tends to terminate all opposition by giving perfect assurance to the mind.—"Wherein," ἐν ᾧ, in which respect; or, on which account; with a view to which; "wherefore;" to confirm the faith of the heirs of the promise. See Robinson's Lexicon under ἐν, 3. c. β.—"Confirmed *it*:" rather, interposed. Interposuit: Vulgate; intervenne: Diodati; "puttid bitwixe:" Wiclif; "interposed:" Rheims.—"Two immutable things:" What these are is by no means clear. Most commentators say, God's ordinary promise several times made to Abraham, and his promise as confirmed by oath. The question will occur, are these really two distinct things, or the same one thing repeated with a confirmatory adjunct? Stuart suggests that the promise thus confirmed by oath to Abraham is the one thing, and the oath of inauguration of Messiah into his priestly office referred to in v. 6, 10, and vi. 20 from Ps. cx. 4, is the other. It has also been suggested, that God himself may be one of the immutable things, as he is so in his nature and character; and his promise, repeated and

the greater; and an oath for confirmation *is* to them an end of all
17 strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed *it* by an oath;
18 that by two immutable things, in which *it was* impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us.
19 Which *hope* we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within
20 the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, *even* Jesus, made a high-priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.

τοῦ μείζονος ὀμνύουσι, καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὁ ὅρκος. Ἐν ᾧ περισσότερον βουλόμενος ὁ θεὸς 17 *ἐπιδεῖξαι τοῖς κληρονόμοις τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ, ἵνα διὰ δύο πραγμά-* 18 *των ἀμεταθέτων, ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι θεόν, ἰσχυρὰν παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν οἱ καταφυγόντες κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος· ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν* 19 *ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, ὅπου πρόδρομος* 20 *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.*

---

attested by oath, the other. The first is perhaps the most probable meaning.—"Consolation:" Stuart prefers "exhortation, persuasion," and connects it with the verb "to hold fast" or "lay hold upon." The Greek word bears either translation, but the construction "who have fled to lay hold of," is in favour of the former.

19, 20. The Christian's hope is here beautifully represented under the image of a strong and safe anchor firmly fixed in heaven, thus securing the spiritual vessel to which it is attached, however she may be tossed about by the storms of the present life. "That entereth into that which is within the veil;" that is, heaven, corresponding with the holy of holies, which is expressed by the same Greek phrase in the Septuagint of Levit. xvi. 2, 12, 15. This analogy is fully drawn out by the author hereafter. See ix. 12, 24, and x. 19, 20.—Peirce considers the Saviour himself to be denoted by the word *hope*, which he interprets "the object of hope," that is, Christ who, he says, is so called in 1 Tim. i. 1, and in Acts xxviii. 20. The applicability of the latter text is doubtful. In its place I will refer the reader to a passage in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, chap. 11, where, in allusion probably to the text in Timothy, he speaks of "Jesus Christ, our hope." Peirce's exposition, however, is quite improbable, since Christ is immediately afterwards said to have already entered as our forerunner. The use of the present tense in reference to the hope seems to imply habitual entrance, while the aorist indicates that Christ hath permanently entered. The character in which he entered into the true holy of holies, as exalted high-priest according to the rank of Melchisedek, is now repeated again, and introduces the topic to which the author has several times adverted.

SECTION III.

Chap. VII.

THE DIGNITY OF CHRIST'S PRIESTHOOD SHOWN FROM ITS ANALOGY TO THAT OF MELCHISEDEK, AND FROM OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES.

The Apostle comes now at last after much preparation to one of the most important topics treated of in the epistle, and which he discusses at greater length than any other. I mean, the priestly and sacrificial character of Christ. The particularity and comprehensiveness of this examination mark his sense of the vast interest attached to the subject. It cannot be said that he merely accommodates in this respect to Jewish views or prejudices, and avails himself of language familiar to his nation, without meaning to give a sanction to sentiments which seem to be thereby definitely expressed. From the contents of the three following chapters it is evident that it is the author's own opinion, that the old Levitical priesthood, sacrifices and services prefigured and represented the function, character and official acts of Christ, and that his intention was to represent the correspondence of the one to the other. If the former are of divine origin, and were instituted partly in order to adumbrate and prepare for the latter, as these chapters manifestly teach, then it is futile to say that the writer merely accommodates to the prevailing language and idea. Doubtless it is true, as Stuart remarks, that he "resorts to comparisons of this nature" from "a regard to the condition and feelings of those whom he addressed;" and certainly "it is allowable that he should reason in a manner best adapted to" this condition. But, as the same interpreter maintains, there is no "accommodation to their mere prejudices." The writer dwells upon the topic in its various details, "not because the Jews exalted the high-priest above Moses, for this surely they did not; but because Christ, in the office of high-priest, performed that peculiar duty which of all others made him what he was, the Saviour *of sinners, the* Redeemer *of lost men*; because as priest he offered an *expiatory sacrifice*, which takes away the sins of the world and makes him the propitiation for their offences."* He considers the incarnation as historically and actually taking place, not to infuse a new element into human nature, but to enable the Redeemer in that nature to atone for sin and thereby to procure grace; and consequently he represents him in his incarnate condition both as real sacrifice and priest.

vii. 1–3. The priesthood of Melchisedek and the particular point on

* Stuart's Commentary; contents of v.—x. 18, pp. 359, 360.

VII. For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and 2 blessed him; to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation king of

Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ, βασιλεὺς VII. *Σαλήμ, ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, ὁ συναντήσας Ἀβραὰμ ὑποστρέφοντι ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς τῶν βασιλέων καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτόν, ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέ-* 2 *ρισεν Ἀβραάμ, πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενος βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ*

which the analogy turns with that of our Lord, have given rise to much discussion. Who and what he was has been a fruitful subject of controversy. The various opinions which, at different times and among various classes, have met with more or less favour, are mentioned briefly by Stuart* and examined by Buddæus,† and the earlier views may be seen also in Suicer.‡ The prevailing Jewish opinion that Melchisedek was Shem, with the older authorities that maintain it and an unnecessarily full refutation of it, may be found in Bochart's Phaleg.§ It had its origin most probably, like many other Jewish figments, in national pride. I shall note but two theories.

Some identify him with the being who is elsewhere represented as appearing to the patriarchs and claiming divine rights and powers. Thus the history in Gen. xiv. 18–20 is an account of one of the theophanies. But this account is so entirely different from those given in the Pentateuch of all the other divine manifestations, as to prove the incongruity of such a supposition. It is simply on the face of it a narrative of one person going to meet another in order to benefit him. Another objection to this theory is, that as the divine personage whose miraculous appearance is referred to was the Logos,‖ it will compel us to admit that the author compares Christ with himself, his incarnate with his ante-incarnate condition, which is wholly unreasonable. And moreover, it presumes him to have had a priesthood while appearing to Abraham, with which his priesthood in his human condition as the son of Mary is compared. Such a notion has not a particle of support in Scripture, and is in itself preposterous. The only rational theory, and in accordance with the scriptural representations, is that which regards Melchisedek as a man.

In reflecting on the subject of Melchisedek, no reader of Scripture can fail to be deeply impressed by the fact that so very little is said about him. In the history it is all comprehended within three verses, and elsewhere in the fourth verse of the 110th Psalm. With these exceptions the Old Testament maintains a profound silence respecting this personage. In the language of Tholuck: "Strange and inexplicable this man stands before us—a priest of the true God whom Abraham alone of all his family (Josh. xxiv. 2,) worshipped, when Heathenism reigned on every side—a priest,

* Excursus xiii.

† Hist. Eccles. V. T. Per. I. Sect. iii. pp. 263-268.

‡ Thes. Eccles. under the word.

§ Lib. ii. cap. i. p. 69.

‖ See note on i. 10-12, p. 39.

βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὅ ἐστι βασιλεὺς εἰρή-	righteousness, and after that also king of Salem, which is, king of

---

who was at the same time a king, who reigned over subjects of the same faith no doubt as himself—a priest whose blessing Abraham receives with so great a feeling of subordination as to lay, as a subject, the tenth of the spoil at his feet! How came this man to Canaan?" [was this his native place? were his people, who under his guidance and authority worshipped the Most High God, of Canaanitish extraction?] "From what race was he sprung? Who instructed him in the true faith? who gave him priestly consecration, and in what did that consist?" To these and other questions of the same kind the inspired history furnishes no reply, and what tradition communicates is manifestly unworthy of confidence. The statements of Josephus, where he goes beyond the record in Genesis, are utterly unfounded. He tells us that 'Melchisedek was a Canaanitish monarch who built Jerusalem, that he first officiated (there?) as a priest, first built the temple, and called the city Hierosolyma (Jerusalem,) which before had the name of Solyma.'* On which passage Bochart very truly remarks, that it contains as many errours as words.† Yet, although the Scriptures contain scarcely any information respecting Melchisedek, the brief announcement of him in the Psalm as priest of a different rank from that of Aaron, analogous to that of King Messiah, and consequently most dignified, seems almost necessarily to imply that, in the time of David, he must have been well known and held in honour among the religious Hebrews. We are compelled either to admit this, or to grant that the announcement in the Psalm must have been an inexplicable enigma.

Salem is by most commentators identified with Jerusalem, which in Ps. lxxvi. 2, is so called. This was the opinion of Jerome, though he remarks that some Jews identified it with a place of the same name near Scythopolis.‡ The historical circumstances mentioned in Gen. xiv., would seem to render it probable that it lay considerably north of the holy city. The words in 2 Sam. xviii. 18, "Abraham had reared up a pillar which is in the king's dale," cannot determine the geographical situation of the place, because it is impossible to settle the locality of the king's dale. To assume that it lay near Jerusalem is to beg the question. Certainty on such a point is unattainable.—It may be worthy of remark that the author founds no argument on the meaning of the words *Salem* and *Melchisedek;* he adduces them simply on account of the analogy. And so in Gal. iv. 25, he merely remarks that *the word Hagar* (τὸ Ἄγαρ,) in its meaning points

* Hudson's Josephus, Jewish War, Lib. vi. p. 1292.

† Chanaan, Lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 715.

‡ See Questions on Genesis and Letter to Evangelius, Opera, Edit. Martian. Tom. ii. pp. 520 and 573.

3 peace; without father, without mother, without descent, having | νης, ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος 3

---

to Sinai in Arabia, thus confirming by an association the analogy he was developing.

"Without father," &c. These expressions have often been adduced in confirmation of the theory that Melchisedek was a celestial being. But it is unreasonable to suppose that such language would be employed by a sensible writer in reference to such a being. To speak either of the divine Logos, or of an angel, as having neither parents nor commencement of life nor genealogy would be preposterous; and certainly such a representation would be very strange in this epistle, and wholly incongruous with its general accuracy. The difficulties therefore which may seem to be involved in this phraseology, so far from being removed by such a theory, are greatly increased. But in truth they are rather apparent than real. The almost entire absence of information respecting Melchisedek which marks the sacred record is a clew to the true meaning of the passage. His parentage both on the side of father and mother is not mentioned, and is consequently unknown; no genealogical list of kings and priests contains either his name or the date of his birth or death; he appears as a person sui generis, in a peculiar capacity, brought into view for a special purpose, acting simply in reference to it, and then vanishing from the reader's notice. The sixth verse contains an intimation from the author himself that such is his meaning. It is a good rule of interpretation founded in the very nature of language, that an obscure statement may receive illustration by some other statement made by the writer in relation to the same subject, if it be accompanied by some explanatory adjunct. Here the rule applies. The idea intended to be conveyed by the term "without descent" or 'genealogy' is more clearly given by the exegetical phrase, "whose genealogy is not counted from them," that is, the Levitical priests, as the preceding verse shows. The reference therefore is to the genealogical lists of priests preserved in the Old Testament, and perhaps in other authenticated Hebrew records. Thus too the meaning of the other connected expressions in the third verse is determined, for every one must admit that they all express the same general thought. Such is the interpretation which has been given of these clauses by the best expositors from the earliest ages until the present. The following quotations will show the uniform testimony of the ancient church.

"Whose father and mother are not written in the genealogies." Peshito Syriac Version.—Justin compares Melchisedek's priesthood with Christ's, but is very general.*—Tertullian, Cyprian and Clement of Alex-

* Dialogue with Trypho, Thirlby's Edition, London, 1722, pp. 202, 203.

ἔχων, ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.

neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son

---

andria, mention Melchisedek, but without any particular explanation.*—Epiphanius comments thus: "Not that he had neither father nor mother, but because they are not mentioned in Scripture."†—Theodoret: "Scripture gives no information respecting his father or mother or nation, neither does it tell us where he lived or where he died; and therefore he is without father," &c. And again, he sums up what he had been saying before: "Therefore, according to the history, he (Melchisedek) has neither beginning of days nor end of life; but according to the truth, the only begotten Son of God, had no beginning and will not have an end:" and to the same purpose he says elsewhere.‡—Chrysostom: "How without father, &c. By their not appearing in Scripture. And why this? Because, as he was without father as respects a (recounted) genealogy, so was Christ in reality, who is without beginning and without end. Of the one we know neither his birth nor death, because they are not written; of the other we know neither, not because they are not written, but because they are not."§—Theophylact: "Not that he had no parents, for he had, like any other man; but because his genealogy is not recounted in Scripture, nor do the names of his parents appear. Thus also Christ is without father, as respects his earthly birth, which was of the virgin; and without mother as to his heavenly, which was of the father alone," &c.‖—Augustine mentions Melchisedek several times, but always as if he supposed him to be a mere man.—Jerome remarks, "that the opinion of Hippolitus, Irenæus, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Emissenus, Apollinaris and Eustathius, is in effect this, that Melchisedek was a man, a Canaanite, and king of Jerusalem." He explains without father, &c., thus: "Because he is suddenly, (or unexpectedly, subito,) introduced in Genesis, and neither mentioned before nor after. The Apostle's discussion is to this effect, that before Levi and Aaron, Melchisedek was a priest of the Gentiles," &c.¶—In a dissertation of Frederic Koerber,** it is said that Ambrose seems to favour the opinion that Melchisedek was the Son of God, and reference is made to his treatise on Abraham. But the original passage does not justify this writer's suspicion. Speaking of the King of Salem, Ambrose says: "He was a priest of the most high God;" and then proceeds as follows: "Who is king of righteousness, priest of

* Tert. adv. Jud. Cap. ii. iii. p. 184, 185, and adv. Marc. Lib. v. cap. ix. pp. 472, Opera, Edit. Rigalt.—Cyp. Epist. lxiii. Opera, Oxon. 1682, p. 149.—Clem. Alex. Strom. Lib. ii. p. 367, and iv. p. 539, Edit. Sylburg.

† Hæres. lv. Lib. ii. Sect. 1. Opera, Edit. Petav. Paris. 1622, tom. i. p. 468.

‡ Comment. on Heb. vii. 3; Opera, Edit. Paris. 1643, tom. iii. p. 424, tom. iv. pp. 61 and 691.

§ Hom. xii. on Hebrews, Opera, Edit. Bened. Venet. 1741, tom. xii. pp. 121, 122.

‖ Comment. on Heb. vii. 3, Opera, Edit. Venet. 1755, tom. ii. p. 692.

¶ Epist. ad Evang. Opera, Edit. Martianay, Paris. 1649, tom. ii. pp. 571, 572.

** In the Thesaurus appended to the Critici Sacri, Part Second, Amstel. 1702, p. 731.

of God, abideth a priest continually. Θεωρεῖτε δέ, πηλίκος οὗτος, ᾧ καὶ δεκά- 4
4 Now consider how great this man

God, but he to whom it is said, thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedek, that is, the Son of God, the priest of the father, who by the sacrifice of his own body propitiated the father on account of our sins?"* Melchisedek and Christ, so far from being identified, are here evidently distinguished from each other. Of the former it is said *he was*, (erat;) of the other, *he is*, (est.) The one is merely said to have been a priest of the true God; the other is represented as his Son, reconciling the father to sinful men.

To the concurrent testimony of the fathers, I will add that of Cardinal Hugo, as his works are exceedingly rare. It will be seen that he follows these early writers. "Without father, without mother: not because he had none, but because the Scripture does not speak of them. Having neither beginning of days nor end of life: that is, it is not written that he had them. Remaineth a priest for ever: because the Scripture says nothing of any successor; or, because his priesthood lasts in Christ and in his church forever."—And yet he explains certain of these clauses of Christ: "Without father; as to his flesh. Without mother; as to his divinity. Without genealogy; because he had no children," filios carnis.†

"Made like unto:" Stuart objects to this, and would translate the Greek, "*like* or *likened to*, that is, being compared to." But this is doubtless the meaning of our translation, "*made*," or *represented* in the historical account of him, "like unto the Son of God."—Whitby's extraordinary notion, that "a son," as he translates τῷ υἱῷ, notwithstanding the article, means an angel, and his equally extraordinary reason, that "the Apostle is not speaking of Melchisedek's likeness to Christ, but of Christ's likeness to him," need no refutation.

"Remaineth a priest forever:" It is certain that these words relate to Melchisedek. Any attempt to explain them of Christ is inconsistent with the connection, and must be a failure. It is useless therefore to examine whether *who* or *he* can be understood before *remaineth*, as no good reason can be given for supposing such an ellipsis. The phrase simply means that Melchisedek continues to be a priest *constantly*, *to the end*. He himself *bears throughout* his priesthood, as the Greek word implies.‡ It all centres in himself, and no other person participates in it. And thus the same phrase "*continually*," is used of the sacrifices offered under the law. See x. 1. This constitutes the analogy between the priesthood of Melchisedek

* Ambrose, de Abraham Patriarcha, Lib. Opera, Paris. 1539, p. 272.

† This may recal to mind one of Aben-Ezra's objections to the application of Isa. liii. 10, to Jesus, because he left no offspring! See Jewish Rabbies, p. 134, 135.

‡ Διηνεκής· from διαφέρω, διήνεγκα.

την Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων, *was,* unto whom even the patriarch

---

and that of Christ. But in determining the particular point of this analogy writers differ. It is maintained by some, that both Melchisedek and Christ are represented as holding their priestly office during life, and thus in contradistinction to the Levitical priests, whose character and functions are said to have expired at the age of 50. The type and the antitype therefore are in this respect alike, each being priest *forever* or *continually* or *as long as he lives*, (which phrases are regarded as equivalent,) the mediatorial life of Christ lasting during the whole period of his intercession and mediation, that is, until the general resurrection and judgment, while that of Melchisedek terminated at his natural death, which really took place, though not recorded.

On this theory there are difficulties not easily removed. Its very foundation needs support. It cannot be proved that the Hebrew priests went out of office at 50. The texts usually referred to determine nothing of the kind. Of the high-priests they are silent; and the law which required man-slayers to remain in their city of refuge "until the death of the high-priest,"* evidently presumes him to continue in the office *as long as he lived*, and this is confirmed by the extreme old age of the *high-priest* Eli.† In defence of the theory Num. iv. 35, 39, 43, 47, are appealed to. But it requires no extraordinary attention to see that the historian is not speaking of priests or Levites as going out of office at 50, but only of their being relieved from laborious service at that age. The law took into consideration the advancing infirmities of its officers, and kindly diminished the previously imposed duty.‡ This is evident, and particularly from Num. viii. 25, 26: "shall *serve* no more, but shall *minister*," &c.; that is, shall not be compelled to perform the severer duties. This is said of Levites, but in all probability, is explanatory of chap. iv., which relates to the priests.

On this theory, Heb. vii. 8, and 23, 24, do not admit of a satisfactory exposition. In the former passage *mortal men* are placed in contradistinction to one who is represented as *living;* in the latter they are spoken of as many, and as not suffered to continue in consequence of death, in opposition to one who remains forever. It is said indeed by a distinguished commentator,§ that "the *literal* sense of the words would make nothing for the writer's purpose," that "of the *natural* life of men he is not speaking, but of the duration of the priestly office." And "therefore" he "understands" (the words) "*that die*" as being used figuratively here, in order to denote the *brief* and *mutable* condition of the Levitical priesthood. In this way, and in this only, can he "make out any tolerable sense of the

* Num. xxxv. 25, 28. † 1 Sam. iv. 15, 18.
‡ And herein it sets an example which Christian communities would do well sometimes to copy.
§ Stuart in loc.

Abraham gave the tenth of the
5 spoils. And verily they that are
of the sons of Levi, who receive

ὁ πατριάρχης. Καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν 5
Λευῒ τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες ἐντο-
λὴν ἔχουσιν ἀποδεκατοῦν τὸν λαὸν

---

passage consistently with the context." But even allowing such a figurative use of language as this exposition assumes, (though the Professor's reference to Schleusner as supporting such a use from 1 Tim. v. 6, is anything but satisfactory,) it cannot be applied here without the greatest extravagance, as the literal sense is demanded by the strength of the expressions and the nature of the case. "Men that die," who do "not continue by reason of death," plainly mean, mortals, who are compelled to yield to the original sentence: "dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return."

It is true, as Professor Stuart says, "that the object of the writer is to show the perpetuity of Melchisedek's priesthood." But this will not prove that ἀποθνήσκοντες (men who die,) must of course have the sense of *short-lived* or *deceasing*, viz. as to office or the priesthood." If the duration of the priesthood and the duration of the individual's life be identical, then the word may retain its usual and literal meaning. And this is confirmed by the remark respecting Christ in ver. 25, "he ever *liveth*." The priesthood of Christianity, or which is the same thing, Christ's priesthood, is commensurate with his *priestly* or *mediatorial life ;* it all centres in *this life* of his, or in him *thus* considered. And so Melchisedek's priesthood, so far as we know anything about it, that is, so far as the Scripture exhibits it, all centres in the individual as one living man, having no existence before or after him; we know of no predecessor; we know of no successor. His whole dispensation, if we may assume such phraseology, is filled up by him as *its only priest.* In this way, "he remaineth a priest forever."

4–10. The argument of the Apostle required him to exhibit the character, office and functions of Melchisedek in the most advantageous light. In showing this unknown king and priest's superiority even to Abraham, who acknowledged his eminent dignity by paying to him the tithes which were his rightful due and by receiving with suitable humility his benediction; to Abraham, the called, yea, "the friend of God," the very distinguished "pillar of the world," as Maimonides calls him,* "*the* patriarch," as the author here in the conclusion of his sentence most strikingly and oratorically styles him; he implies *a fortiori* his vast superiority to the usual priestly and Levitical succession. And thus, with a logical ability, indicative of no common mind, he prepares the way for developing the immeasurable superiority of Christ as the priest of God, like his human yet very illustrious type. This may serve to illustrate the author's general course of thought.

* Jewish Rabbies, p. 211.

κατὰ τὸν νόμον, τοῦτ' ἔστι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν, καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ 6 τῆς ὀσφύος Ἀβραάμ· ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν δεδεκάτωκε τὸν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα τὰς ἐπαγγε- 7 λίας εὐλόγηκε. Χωρὶς δὲ πάσης ἀντιλογίας τὸ ἔλαττον ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείτ- 8 τονος εὐλογεῖται. Καὶ ὧδε μὲν δεκάτας ἀποθνήσκοντες ἄνθρωποι λαμβά-

the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham: But 6 he, whose descent is not counted from them, received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises. And without all contra- 7 diction the less is blessed of the better. And here men that die re- 8

"Who receive the office of the priesthood:" that is, those among the posterity of Levi who were of the family of Aaron, and were properly priests. It is not necessary to make the word "priesthood" so general as to comprehend all the Levites, although tithes were paid to them. The author might have made this remark even of the inferior body, who were authorized to tithe the people,* but he prefers limiting it to the superior, the priests properly so called, as it strengthens his representation. The higher official characters under the law tithed their brethren, the descendants of Abraham, but here we have a personage who tithes Abraham, and consequently is more dignified than even these. "The less is blessed by the greater." The degree of inferiority here implied must, of course, be understood with such limitations as the respective position of the parties necessarily implies. One who in many respects is vastly superior to another may nevertheless receive a blessing from him, and in this particular be and acknowledge himself to be his inferior. And thus Pharaoh was blessed by Jacob.†—The last clause of the 8th verse may be regarded as already explained. Melchisedek is testified of solely as one living. His death is not stated. Consequently he appears in remarkable contrast to the Levitical priests, who were a succession of mortal men.—Any objection which might be urged against the reasoning of the 9th and 10th verses is removed by the palpable fact, that the author himself modifies the degree in which it is to be applied. He is aware himself that it must not be greatly pressed, and therefore introduces it with the qualifying remark, "as I may say," if I may venture to corroborate my argument by such a statement. This is the meaning of the Greek, as appears from any good lexicon. See Scott and Liddell or Passow under ἔπος. It has indeed another meaning; 'to speak briefly, to say all in one word.' But the former is preferable. That strict logical precision is not intended, is not only plain on the face of the passage, but clear too from the consideration that otherwise it would prove too much, as our Lord himself might then be said to have paid tithes in Abraham, from whom he as well as Levi descended. Macknight denies

* See Num. xviii. 24, and other places.

† Gen. xlvii. 10.

ceive tithes; but there he *receiveth them* of whom it is witnessed that 9 he liveth. And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, 10 payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, 11 when Melchisedec met him. ✗ If

νουσιν, ἐκεῖ δὲ μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ. Καί, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, διὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ 9 *Λευὶ ὁ δεκάτας λαμβάνων δεδεκάτωται· ἔτι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ τοῦ πατρὸς* 10 *ἦν, ὅτε συνήντησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ.* 11 *Εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις διὰ τῆς Λευϊτικῆς ἱερωσύνης ἦν, (ὁ λαὸς γὰρ*

that this is a legitimate conclusion, because "he had no human father." But this would make no difference, as his humanity was derived from "the substance of the blessed virgin," his mother, as is truly stated in the second of the Thirty-nine Articles. To speak of a person being in his ancestor is not without example of parallel language among the Hebrews. In Deut. x. 22, it is said, "Thy fathers went down into Egypt *in* (not *with* as in our translation,) three score and ten persons." Joseph's sons are thus comprehended as having gone down *in their father*, though born in Egypt. Comp. Deut. xxvi. 5: "in" (not "with) a few." And the same idea is implied in the promise made to Jacob, "I will surely bring *thee* up again," which of course was intended of his posterity. Gen. xlvi. 4. In further illustration of this principle, the reader is referred to my Companion to the Book of Genesis, note 145, pp. 337, 338. It is there applied with a view to the chronological difficulties connected with the account of the number of Jacob's family said to have descended to Egypt.

11. The author now proceeds to apply what he had just been saying, and also what he had before said of Messiah's priesthood being like that of Melchisedek, to the subject of the chapter.—"Perfection:" A comparison of some other places in this epistle and elsewhere will enable us to determine the meaning: "The law made nothing perfect," ver. 19: "Sacrifices could not perfect as pertaining to the conscience," ix. 9: "the law can never by (its) sacrifices make the comers perfect," x. 1. Add also Rom. viii. 3, and Gal. iii. 21. The perfection not attainable by the Levitical priesthood or the system of religion connected with it, is undoubtedly what the fallen condition of man made necessary; that is, satisfactory atonement, peace of conscience, acceptableness with God, divine aid by which we live a holy life, and well founded expectation of future blessedness. All these together make up that perfection which the law and its priesthood could only prepare for, to give which is peculiar to that priest who alone is of the rank of Melchisedek.

"For under it the people received the law." The more accurate translation is probably *with* or *in connection with*. This is sustained by the meaning of the preposition, and also by the scope of the writer. It is hardly correct to say that the law was received *under* the priesthood, when the establishment of the priesthood was a part of the law. But, inasmuch as the author proceeds to show that the predicted abrogation of the priest-

ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομοθέτητο,) τίς ἔτι χρεία, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν 12 Ἀαρὼν λέγεσθαι; Μετατιθεμένης γὰρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ νόμου 13 μετάθεσις γίνεται. Ἐφ' ὃν γὰρ λέγεται ταῦτα, φυλῆς ἑτέρας μετέσχηκεν, ἀφ' ἧς οὐδεὶς προσέσχηκε τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ· 14 πρόδηλον γὰρ, ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, εἰς ἣν φυλὴν οὐδὲν 15 περὶ ἱερωσύνης Μωϋσῆς ἐλάλησε. Καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλόν ἐστιν, εἰ κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδὲκ ἀνίσ-

therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need *was there* that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priest- 12 hood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For he of whom these things 13 are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For *it is* evident 14 that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood. And it is 15

---

hood in the announcement of another like Melchisedek's implied also an intended abrogation of the law, it was directly to his purpose to intimate the close connection of the two. Professor Stuart takes the same view of the parenthesis: "The meaning is, that the priesthood and the law are inseparably linked together, so that if one be changed, the other must of necessity be."

12, 13. The illative force of γάρ, *for*, may easily be supplied by the reader from the connection of the remarks. In ver. 12 it relates to the connection just mentioned of the priesthood and the law. The implied answer to the question put is, that in consequence of such connection, the change of the one necessarily produced a change of the other. Verse 13: 'This change of the priesthood actually took place, *for* Christ the subject spoken of did not belong to the priestly tribe; for (ver. 14,) it is well known that our Lord descended from Judah.'

14–17. Tholuck thinks that ἀνατέταλκεν is employed in allusion to the term branch, ἀνατολή, which is used of the Messiah, and Peile seems to suppose a reference to his being said ἀνατέλλειν, to *arise*, as the sun, thus giving light. But probably the word merely expresses human origin from some particular source. This meaning is given to it by Passow.—The application of πρόδηλον is not certain. It may be connected with the point, already stated, the change namely of the priesthood, and then ὅτι will mean *for*, and the idea be this: 'Such a change was no doubt intended, *for* it is shown clearly by the fact that "our Lord sprang from Judah." Then the next verse will continue the proof: 'And that this change was intended is yet more abundantly evident, if (or since, εἰ,) another priest like Melchisedek rises up.' 'But the connection may be with the statement immediately preceding, and then ὅτι must be rendered *that*, and the meaning will be as in our English translation. This view is most gener-

yet far more evident; for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there
16 ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of
17 an endless life: for he testifieth, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the
18 order of Melchisedec. For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness

ταται ἱερεὺς ἕτερος, ὃς οὐ κατὰ νόμον 16
ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου. Μαρτυρεῖ
γάρ· ὅτι σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ 17
τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ. Ἀθέτησις μὲν 18
γὰρ γίνεται προαγούσης ἐντολῆς διὰ τὸ
αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές, οὐδὲν 19

---

ally followed by interpreters. In this case the phrase "yet far more evident," will not be a comparison with what was just said to be "evident," but must be connected with the change of the law and priesthood implied in the necessary union of the two, and with the fact stated in ver. 13, namely that Christ belonged to a different tribe from that of Levi. Still, the use of πρόδηλον, immediately followed by περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλον, seems to favour the other view. I have therefore introduced both in the analysis. In ver. 15 *εἰ* should be rendered *if* or *since*, which is probably the meaning of "*for that*" in our translation. Peirce, following Whitby, explains it by "*that* or *because*." But the particle expresses the condition on which the change under consideration is said to be the more abundantly evident.—The efficacy and perpetuity of Christ's priesthood are represented in contradistinction to the imperfection of the former. The one was in accordance with a system of laws of an outward, weak and transitory nature; the other was in character with a life indestructible.

18, 19. The *for* is illative of what precedes.—This sentence is susceptible of different interpretations. The word *commandment* has been explained in reference to the law respecting the priesthood, as in Rom. vii. 8, it has been limited to the particular commandment, "thou shalt not covet." But here, the reason given for the "annulling," namely, the "weakness and uselessness" of the commandment, applies to the law as a whole; and so in Romans, "the commandment coming," "the commandment for life," and other places of the same sort, accord best with the idea of the moral law as a whole. It is elsewhere used in this general sense; as, for instance in 2 Pet. ii. 21, "turn from the holy commandment," and in iii. 2, "the commandment of us, the Apostles," &c. The general thought, too, has been variously given. That of the 18th verse is plain: 'the heretofore existing law is annulled on account of its imperfection and consequent inefficiency.' But the next verse is susceptible of different shades of signification. The meaning may be thus: 'For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope (that is, the Gospel,) by which we draw nigh to God did.' This merely requires the very usual ellipsis of

γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος, ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν
20 τῷ θεῷ. Καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρ-
21 κωμοσίας, (οἱ μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες, ὁ δὲ μετὰ ὁρκωμοσίας διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς αὐτόν· ὤμοσε κύριος, καὶ οὐ μεταμεληθήσεται· σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν
22 Μελχισεδέκ,) κατὰ τοσοῦτον κρείττονος
23 διαθήκης γέγονεν ἔγγυος Ἰησοῦς. Καὶ οἱ μὲν πλείονές εἰσι γεγονότες ἱερεῖς

thereof: for the law made nothing 19 perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope *did*; by the which we draw nigh unto God. And inasmuch as 20 not without an oath *he was made priest*; (for those priests were made 21 without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:) by so much was 22 Jesus made a surety of a better testament. And they truly were many 23 priests, because they were not suf-

---

the verb which is expressed at the beginning of the sentence. Or, "the annulling" of ver. 18 may be antithetic to "the bringing in" of the next, the first clause of which will be parenthetic; and the meaning may be expressed thus: 'There is indeed an annulling of the previously existing commandment on account of its weakness and uselessness, (for the law brought nothing to perfection,) and there is the bringing in,' &c. The opposition between the μέν and the δέ in the two verses is much in favour of this view, and perhaps it conveys the true meaning. Nevertheless, another may be suggested, which, as it agrees with the leading idea of a large part of the epistle, is certainly entitled to consideration. I should not hesitate to regard it as the most probable, if there were no doubt at all of the word ἐπεισαγωγὴ bearing the sense required. It has the sanction of Tyndale and Cranmer, and is this: 'The law perfected nothing, but was (merely) the introduction of a better hope,' &c. Then the Mosaic system will be represented as introductory to the Christian. It is not the perfect building, but the vestibule merely, the porch of that grand and glorious temple which the infinitely wise mind had planned. It was the adumbration of future good things, the mere shadow or sketch, and not even the image or portrait, much less the living reality. This would be a fair sense of εἰσαγωγὴ, and may be of the same word with the preposition ἐπί as in the text. Properly this word means *the introduction upon*, *additional or consequent to*, that is, *the adding to*, something else; although Passow does give as one meaning "the bringing in, Einfuehrung." The last view of this text is given by Erasmus and Zuingle: erat (lex) introductio et pædagogus ad meliorem spem. But Tholuck thinks that this is improper and opposed by the preposition.

20–25. The author having shown the superiority of Christ's priesthood to that of the Levitical succession, inasmuch as it was of the rank of Melchisedek, that dignified king and priest, whose eminence was recognised

fered to continue by reason of death; 24 but this *man*, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. 25 Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for

διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν· ὁ δέ, διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 24 ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην· ὅθεν 25 καὶ σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελὲς δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ, πάντοτε ζῶν, εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν

---

even by Abraham, the patriarch, and who consequently was vastly greater than the Aaronical priests, now proceeds to point out certain particulars illustrative of this superiority. The first is stated in vs. 20, 22. Christ was inaugurated high-priest with the solemnity of an oath, sworn by Jehovah himself, who appointed him to this dignity. This was an extraordinary circumstance, which made no part of the Levitical ordination. Εἰσι γεγονότες both here and in ver. 23, is equivalent to γεγονάσι. Comp. ῇ πεποιηκὼς for πεποιήκῃ in James v. 15, and ἦν ἔχων for ἔσχε in Matt. xix. 22.—Ἔγγυος means a sponsor, surety; and the previous use of ἐγγίζομεν may have suggested it. The covenant or dispensation of which Christ is surety for those that belong to it, is vastly better than the Mosaic.—The second particular is comprised in what follows, vs. 23, 24. The Levitical priests were numerous, because they were prevented from continuing by death; they were a race of mortal men continually dying off, and thus showing their instability and imperfection. But Christ, inasmuch as he remains permanently in his office, possesses the priesthood which does not pass away, but is perpetual.

The word ἀπαράβατον may express the idea that Christ's priesthood does not pass over from himself to any other individual. Thus Diodati: non trapassa ad un' altro; and Stuart: "a priesthood without succession;" and Robinson: "never passing from him to another;" and Peile: "which passeth not from him to any other, literally, hath his priesthood not transferable, ἀδιάδοχον, ἀτέλευτον. Theoph. Œcum." This is undoubtedly true. The Christian priesthood, properly speaking, is confined to Christ himself; this is a part of that glory which he does not give to any other. The office of the Christian ministry with its various gifts he dispensed to his church on his ascension; but the sacerdotal is his own peculiar function. It does not pass beyond himself, and an assumption of it by any human agent is without scriptural warrant. Still I am inclined to think that the Apostle means to convey the idea that Christ's priesthood does not pass off. Like his "life" mentioned in ver. 16, it is continual and indestructible. This sense of the word agrees best with the context. Thus in ver. 23 while it is implied, of course, that, as the Jewish priests are many, their office passes to their successors, yet the expression is, they do not *remain*. But Christ *does remain forever; he ever liveth*. His is the unfailing priesthood. Hence it follows in the next verse: 'Because he ever liveth to in-

26	ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. Τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεύς, ὅσιος, ἄκακος, ἀμίαντος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, καὶ	them. For such a high-priest became us, *who is* holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;	26
27	ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος, ὃς οὐκ ἔχει καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνάγκην, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, πρότερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίας ἀναφέρειν, ἔπειτα	who needeth not daily, as those high-priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for	27

tercede, he is able to save continually and perfectly those who believe in him.' To come to Christ is to believe in him, implying, of course, whatever is essential to a right faith. See John vi. 35, 37, Matt. xi. 28. The life of Christ here spoken of is his present glorified life as our advocate with God in heaven. What is here said accords with and probably is founded on our Lord's language to his Apostles: "Because I live ye shall live also," John xiv. 19. Compare also St. Paul's remark in Romans v. 10, "We shall be saved by his life." The phrase "to the uttermost," implies not only his ability to save "all sorts and conditions of men," however diversified, but also to continue saving until the end of time. And this last idea is comprehended in the point of the perpetuity of the priesthood as vested wholly in his own individual person. As his life is unending, so also is his sacerdotal character.

26, 27. Another particular wherein Christ's superiority is shown consists in his perfect moral character, which was not only free from every sinful defilement, but also characterized by positive excellence and thorough accordance with God's nature and law, and in consequence of which he is infinitely elevated. Hence he has no occasion to repeat his sacrifice habitually or daily, as was the case in the tabernacle or temple service; but his one perfect sacrifice availed in behalf of all and forever. Such a high-priest was adapted to human wants, and alone able to meet them. The γάρ, *for*, is illative. God hath promised such a high-priest, *because* we need such a one. With "made higher than the heavens," compare Phil. ii. 9, "God hath highly exalted him;" Eph. iv. 10, "far above all heavens;" Heb. iv. 14, "passed through the heavens;" and see on ii. 10. In addition to the prominent thought of ver. 27, namely, the one availing sacrifice of Christ in contradistinction to the repeated sacrifices of the law, a striking point of contrast is, that the high-priest's offerings were for his own sins as well as for those of the people, but Christ was without sin, and consequently needed no atonement.—Καθ' ἡμέραν, *daily*, may be used for *constantly*, *regularly*, *repeatedly*, the idea of the particular space of time denoted by the original meaning of the word being lost sight of. Or else, though speaking of the high-priest, the author may employ terms applicable to the *daily* priestly duties.

28. On this verse Cardinal Hugo remarks thus: "But the word of the oath which is after the law: (the word) spoken by David. Constituted the

the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself. 28 For the law maketh men high-priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, *maketh* the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.

τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ, ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας. 28 Ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς ἔχοντας ἀσθένειαν, ὁ λόγος δὲ τῆς ὁρκωμοσίας τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον.

---

priest: that is, declares in constituting; the Son who is to continue forever. Perfect, that is, full of grace and truth: as if he had said, the law constituted a servant weak and mortal; but the word of the oath, constituted the Son who is perfect and eternal." The verse implies the aggregate of all that has been before said in the chapter. The law constituted weak men high-priests: weak, inasmuch as they are sinful and require propitiation themselves; inasmuch as they are degraded to a condition of imperfection and wretched helplessness; inasmuch as they are mortal, and their office requires a succession of ephemeral creatures. Such is the legal priesthood, and such must be every merely human priesthood. But the declaration of the oath, by which subsequently to the law God announced Christ as high-priest according to the rank of Melchisedek, consecrates to this office the Son who is infinitely and eternally elevated to perfection of character, and to the highest dignity and happiness. Υἱὸν is plainly governed by καθίστησιν understood. See the note on ii. 10.

This seventh chapter is one complete section of itself. It contains, briefly expressed, several important thoughts which in the two following ones are more fully developed. Its statements are made with great distinctness and in general with equal perspicuity. Its whole course of argument is accurate and logical, and indicates a highly cultivated and spiritual mind. Whether St. Paul were the author or not, it is certain that in no respect is this portion, and I might add any other portion, of the epistle unworthy of even his extraordinary intellect and spirituality.

SECTION IV.

CHAP. VIII.—X. 18.

CHRIST AS PRIEST AND SACRIFICE SUPERIOR TO THOSE OF THE LAW.

THIS section extends from the beginning of the 8th chapter to x. 18 inclusive. The analysis will give the reader the general train of thought. The exercise of Christ's priestly office in heaven is represented as analogous to that of the high-priest in the holy of holies on the day of atonement, and its efficacy in securing man's pardon thereby clearly illustrated and made prominent. The whole representation is intended to satisfy the anxious and inquiring Jewish mind on this grand point, the satisfactory character of the scheme of the Gospel, which the tabernacle or temple service could only imperfectly adumbrate.

The reader who can penetrate the exterior covering and look into the inward reality will not suppose that the author's course of thought implies the existence of arrangements in heaven, regarded in reference to locality, like those of the two Mosaic tabernacles with their various appurtenances. He will readily perceive that language which fitly and accurately describes the latter is accommodated to the realities of the former, in accordance with the principle which shows itself throughout the whole Bible, and which gives shape and beauty to all its figurative declarations. What the Hebrew services indicated to be originally necessary, what their continued repetition intimated still to continue to be equally necessary, because they were never entirely effective and therefore constantly reacted, is fully and effectively done forever by Christ. Having voluntarily offered on the cross a piacular victim in the one sacrifice of himself, which is abundantly sufficient, and any attempt to repeat which on the part of man is consequently at the best nothing but a pretence and may be a sacrilegious one, he ascends in a condition of glory and reward to his Father. His thus being in this heavenly state is equivalent to a continual and effective intercession for those on account of whom he suffered, and available to their everlasting salvation.

It is evident that the Mosaic tabernacles and services with their various appliances, give shape and colouring to the author's language, much of which must be regarded as figurative. But it does not by any means follow that the representations which, under this garb, he does make of Christian truths are mere unmeaning figments in accommodation to Jewish prejudice and errour. Figurative language is as really truthful as any other,

VIII. Now of the things which we have spoken *this is* the sum: We

Κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, VIII. τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα, ὃς ἐκάθισεν

---

and conveys as definite a thought, although it may not always be equally apparent. Our author's representation may not indeed oblige us to conceive of heaven as consisting of two distinct divisions corresponding with the holy and the most holy places of the tabernacle; or that the Redeemer has taken into the innermost his material blood in order to present it as the element of atonement in the very presence of God. Such notions are extravagant and gross, incompatible with the general representations of Scripture, and with the elevation of thought and feeling which mark this whole epistle. As well might we fancy a material temple, altar, incense; or figure to ourselves the king of heaven as seated on a material throne, with a sceptre in his right hand and his angel-courtiers standing round about him. Every thing of this sort is figurative. But it has meaning. The one class of figures teaches that, by the action of Christ, the infinite sanctity of the Holy One is brought into harmony with man made penitent and believing; the other, that God is the one Lord of all creation which he governs with illimitable power and unbounded benevolence.

Neither on the other hand can it be said, that the author of the epistle in throwing his language into the mould of Hebrew thought and expression, does thereby intimate or teach that the Hebrew thought so expressed is therefore of merely human origin. It does not thereupon follow, that the views of priesthood, sacrifice, atonement, propitiation, and others of a similar sort, which are here constantly brought prominently forward, were simply the gradual development of human feeling and reflection, and therefore cannot be adduced as directly teaching Christian doctrine. This would be to assume the human origin of the whole Mosaic system, which system is the groundwork of the comparisons here drawn out and the doctrines thereupon deducible. It is evident that the author goes throughout on the admission, or rather the avowal, that the Mosaic system was of divine origin, and he recognises its institutions as intended by their author to have a bearing on the action of the Messiah and its results. On these presumptions he draws out his details. And if this be so, the conclusion is inevitable, not that the epistle accommodates to weak Jewish prejudices, but that the divinely originated Mosaic system was instituted with the express view of prefiguring those particulars in our Lord's course of Messianic action both on earth and in heaven which are embodied in the prominent points of Christian doctrine. This truth lies at the bottom of the whole succeeding representation.

viii. 1. Κεφάλαιον should not be translated *sum*, for what follows is certainly not the aggregate or substance of what had been before said. It means here a *prominent point.* Ἐπί may mean *among* or *in addition to.*

ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης have such a high-priest, who is set
2 ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς on the right hand of the throne of

---

The point to be stated is that Christ exercises his priestly office in heaven. As this has been already implied, (see i. 3, iv. 14, 15, vi. 19, 20, vii. 26,) it may be classed among the topics of the former portion of the epistle, and the clause be explained thus: 'Among the matters of discourse a principal one is,' &c. But, as the author is now about to declare it expressly, to develop it fully and in detail, he may very well introduce it as a new subject, even with apparently more propriety than St. John does the commandment to "love one another." 1 John ii. 8. Before he had barely alluded to it; now he enters into the particulars. Diodati's translation agrees with this view: "Or, oltr' alle cose suddette, il principal capo è, che," &c. The Vulgate also has *super*. But it is followed by the present tense, ea quæ *dicuntur*. And this agrees accurately with the Greek, which properly means not *have been* but *are being spoken*. Most probably the author regards both the allusions already made to this point and the fuller disclosures which he intends to make. Thus we find in Luke ii. 33 the present participle employed both in reference to what Simeon had just said, and probably to what the narrative immediately after states that he continued to say. On the whole, then, *among* would seem to be the most suitable translation of ἐπί, and the main thought in the chapter may be thus expressed: 'Among the various truths in course of being spoken, a most important matter is this, that our high-priest is so dignified as to exercise his office in heaven. There he officiates as our priest, and the sacred places of service under the Mosaic system were only prefigurative of the heavenly. Consequently the dispensation of which he is the priest is better than that, and thus Jeremiah describes it.'

Although in this section the author represents Christ as exercising his priestly functions in heaven, yet this does not disprove his priestly character while on earth. The comparison here lies between his sacerdotal action and that of the high-priest on the day of atonement; and as this was chiefly in the most holy place, it was necessary to dwell chiefly on Christ's presentation of himself in heaven. The true scriptural theory is, that the offering of Christ made once for all on the cross, becomes perfectly effectual by his constantly presenting himself to God in heaven. In both his earthly and heavenly conditions, his sacrificial and priestly characters must be conceded. The opposite view is said by Tholuck in loc. to have originated with the Socinians.

2. The plural ἁγίων most probably refers to the holy of holies or most holy place. In ix. 3, the full phrase occurs, but in ix. 8, 12, 24, 25, x. 19, we have the single word. It is often explained of the temple or sanctuary in general. But as Christ is here spoken of as the "minister" thereof, and

2 the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord 3 pitched, and not man. For every high-priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore *it is* of necessity that this man have some-

καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος. 3 *Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας καθίσταται· ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον, ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον ὃ προσενέγκῃ.* 4 *Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐδ' ἂν ἦν ἱερεύς,*

---

is in the subsequent chapter represented as exercising his ministry like the high-priest when on the day of expiation he went into the *most holy place*, it is more in analogy with this representation so to understand it here. The plural may express distinction, superiority, as the word "sacrifices" most probably does in ix. 23.—"The true tabernacle;" that is, heaven, of which the Hebrew tabernacles were emblematic. It is called *true*, to denote its excellence and perfection. This is a very usual meaning of the word, the force of which must not be limited merely to what is opposed to falsehood. Thus Christ speaks of himself as "the *true* bread from heaven," in contradistinction to the manna not as false or unreal food but as imperfect, temporary in its effects, which were limited to the sustenance of animal life, and also as typical of food infinitely better. John vi. 32. And God's "ways" are said to be *true*, because in accordance with his infinite perfections. Rev. xv. 3. And therefore it is said of this *true* tabernacle, to mark still further its distinguished excellence: "Which the Lord pitched and not man;" meaning, it is God's immediate and most important work. Compare "not made with hands" in ix. 11, and see Col. ii. 11, where the same appellation is applied to that internal character of which outward circumcision was the symbol.

The apocryphal Book of Wisdom contains some very remarkable passages like those of the Apostle both here and in the next chapter, and the phraseology is occasionally the very same. We meet with ναὸν—θυσιαστήριον, μίμημα σκηνῆς ἁγίας ἣν προητοίμασας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. ix. 8. Ἁγίων also is used in x. 10, in the same way as here. I give the extracts from our English translation. "Thou hast commanded me to build *a temple* upon thy holy mount, and an *altar* in the city wherein thou dwellest, *a resemblance of the holy tabernacle which thou hast prepared from the beginning*." This language is put into the mouth of Solomon. And in the other passage it is said of Jacob: "When the righteous fled from his brother's wrath, wisdom guided him in right paths, *showed him the kingdom of God*, and gave him knowledge *ἁγίων*, *of holy things*," or *places*, meaning heaven. The author refers undoubtedly to Jacob's divinely communicated dream.

3. It is certain from this remark, that the apostle regards Christ as a real high-priest. If the word were applied to him merely, by a figure to illustrate his personal dignity, the necessity of his having some sacrifice to offer in order to sustain his character, would not at all follow.

ὄντων τῶν ἱερέων τῶν προσφερόντων
5 κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὰ δῶρα, οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσι τῶν ἐπουρανίων, καθὼς κεχρημάτισται Μωϋσῆς μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνήν· (ὅρα γάρ, φησί, ποιήσῃς πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει·)
6 νυνὶ δὲ διαφορωτέρας τέτευχε λειτουργίας, ὅσῳ καὶ κρείττονός ἐστι διαθήκης

what also to offer. For if he were 4 on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: (who serve unto the example and 5 shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: (for, See, saith he, *that* thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the

---

4. The meaning is obviously this, that a merely earthly priest, who could exercise his sacerdotal functions simply in this world, is not required, as those of the Mosaic dispensation suffice to perform such services. See note on vs. 5, 6, p. 67.

5. "Who serve unto the example:" The same word in ix. 23, is rendered "patterns." It means, a copy, representation, something that corresponds with, as the word substituted for it in ix. 24, properly signifies. The addition of "unto" in our English translation is both useless and unwarranted. The original verb here expresses the services of divine worship, and these services are directed to God, and in accordance with the laws of the Hebrew sanctuary which was an imperfect representation of the heavenly holy of holies. The priests are therefore said to *serve this representation*, as we may speak of a clergyman's serving the church or a parish. Comp. xiii. 10, "who *serve the tabernacle.*"

The heavenly holy of holies thus represented is doubtless the spiritual reality above; a sanctuary in the fullest possible sense, and in a degree such as no material structure can adequately impress upon the mind. But still any localities corresponding with the Hebrew holy and most holy places are not to be thought of, as this would tend to materialize our conceptions, and be inconsistent with the spirituality of thought and feeling which Christianity every where teaches, and which pervade this admirable epistle. —How the instruction or pattern was communicated to Moses, whether by an inspiring and directing influence on his mind, or through the medium of a representation made to him when under divine influence the vivid impressions of which he was enabled to retain, it is perhaps impossible to say. The most natural sense of the words employed to express this communication both in the Old and New Testaments, and the usual mode of conveying divine information by prophetic vision, seem to be in favour of the latter supposition.*

6. 'The ministry which Jesus possesses is superior to that of the law, in

* See Ex. xxv. 9, 40; Acts vii. 44; 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, 12, 18, 19; also Discourses on Prophecy, 4th, p. 70.

6 mount. But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was estab-

μεσίτης, ἥτις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται. Εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη 7

---

proportion as the dispensation of which he is the mediator is better, which hath been established in connection with better promises.' The verse abounds with important thought. Νυνί, now, is not here so much a mark of time, as a formula to introduce with earnestness something which has close and may have even logical connection with what precedes. The connection is easily seen and felt, although it may be difficult to express it clearly. I will endeavour to illustrate my meaning by a few examples, the first of which is taken from this epistle. "But now, νῦν, or νυνί, they earnestly desire a better," xi. 16; "but now Christ hath risen from the dead," 1 Cor. xv. 20; "but now God hath set the members," &c., xii. 18, 20. It is evident that in none of these cases does it designate time, but rather certainty or strong conviction arising out of something before said. And so also, most probably, in 1 Cor. v. 11, though frequently otherwise understood. In ver. 9 the Apostle says, "I have written to you in *the* epistle," τῇ ἐπίστολῇ, meaning that in which the passage occurs, "not to (keep) company with fornicators." He refers undoubtedly to the direction which he had just given to excommunicate the incestuous person. He then proceeds to qualify what he had said, showing that he did not mean to interdict all intercourse with persons of this or other vicious character among the heathen; which would be equivalent to a direction to go out of the world. Then he resumes what he had before said: "but now I have written to you;" that is, in the directions relating to the incestuous person. The same is the force of the particle here.

I have rendered λειτουργία *ministry* rather than *ministration*, because the verb *obtained* is better adapted to the former than the latter, and the function is more distinguished than the acts that spring from it. Thus also διακονία in 2 Cor. iii. 7, 9, though it may be explained of the ministering service, is much better understood of the office itself, as is proved from its being contrasted with that of the Christian system in 8, 9, and iv. 1.—"Mediator:" As the original mediator between God and the Hebrews was Moses, who by divine direction appointed for this purpose a priestly succession, so now under the Gospel Christ is the one and only proper mediator between God and the human family. See 1 Tim. ii. 5.—"Testament:" This is the usual classical meaning of διαθήκη, the word for covenant being συνθήκη. But in Hellenistic Greek the former is constantly employed, and that is its meaning here. Of course, as applied to the dispensations made by God with men, we are not to imagine a mere arrangement effected by originally independent parties. A religious dispensation which

ἦν ἄμεμπτος, οὐκ ἂν δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο 8 *τόπος. Μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοῖς λέγει· ἰδού, ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει κύριος, καὶ συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα διαθήκην καινήν,* 9 *οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν ἐποίησα τοῖς*

lished upon better promises. 7 For if that first *covenant* had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. 8 For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with

---

God may establish with any of his creatures must originate with himself, and he imposes its obligations on the recipient; although, in accommodation to human weakness, he may graciously give a pledge that he will fulfil the promises which he has been pleased to attach to it, on condition of suitable obedience to the law which he may have instituted. Thus such an arrangement has some of the essential elements of a mutual covenant. The word appears first in this epistle in vii. 22, and in this and the following chapters is of frequent occurrence. The better covenant or dispensation here spoken of, is said to be established as a law in connection with better promises than those of the former. The Greek words seem to have been chosen in reference to those in vii. 11. The better promises are doubtless those of "life and immortality which have been brought to light through the Gospel," (2 Tim. i. 10,) the promises of everlasting salvation through Christ. The Mosaic dispensation of itself had none such. Its sanctions were temporal. The expectation of future felicity, existing in various degrees among the members of the old legal covenant, originated anterior to it, existed independently of it, and was in a measure identical with that of the Gospel.

7–12. In accordance with the last remark is the language that follows. The thought in the 7th verse is the same as is elsewhere stated, (see on vii. 11,) namely, the inadequacy of the law. "Finding fault" relates to the law. This is evident from its connection with "faultless" immediately preceding, and also from the fact that the portion of Jeremiah here quoted contains no censure except what is implied in a short clause in the 9th verse. On the contrary, it is characterized throughout by the promise of a more spiritual dispensation, the influence of which should be internal and general. See Jer. xxxi. 31–34, and compare Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26, 27. The prophecy here quoted refers to the Gospel as established by the Messiah. It has been said to relate to improvement in the religious condition of Jews and Israelites after the Babylonian captivity. But any such attempt to explain the prophecy is idle, as history exhibits no condition of the people at all corresponding with the description given. This however would be of little weight with the class of interpreters alluded to, who would not hesitate to attribute the prophet's representation to overheated imagination, and to regard the result as proving his errour. The language itself, however, plainly shows that it is not an improvement of an old state of things, but

the house of Israel and with the
9 house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.
10 For this *is* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I

πατράσιν αὐτῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν, ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου· ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐκ τῇ διαθήκῃ μου, κἀγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, λέγει κύριος. 10 *Ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, λέγει κύριος, διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς· καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς*

---

the introduction of a new and better religious system, which is the topic of discourse. And indeed this has been felt by some of the wisest of the Jewish writers, notwithstanding the unwillingness of certain among them to admit the truth on this subject.

In confirmation of the remark just made, I quote from two distinguished Hebrew writers. The first admission is given by Tholuck in his Commentary on the Hebrews in loc., from a work of Rabbi Joseph Albo of the 15th century, entitled Foundations of the Jewish Law. This intelligent author remarks as follows:—" When God gave the law, he knew that this form of education was sufficient for a certain period which his wisdom had fixed, to prepare those who received it, and incline their minds to admit the second form, although God has revealed this to no man. Like a physician, who prescribes a diet to his patient until a certain period, which he knows but which he does not tell the patient; when however the time is at hand in which the sick man is to recover, the physician changes his diet, permits what he had forbidden and forbids what he had permitted. The patient need not then wonder at this. It resembles the manner in which the teacher conducts himself towards his pupil, to whom at the beginning he gives an easy and comprehensible lesson, until he has gradually accustomed him to instruction, when he leads him up to a higher and more difficult stage." The Christian reader will regard this as a comment on the Apostle's language: " the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ," Gal. iii. 24. The other passage is a quotation from the no less celebrated Abarbanel, commenting on the words of Jeremiah: "This declaration shows that, in the time of the future redemption, God will give to his people *a new law, other and different from that which we* (*now*) *have*." It is impossible not to perceive how perfectly this admission coincides with the view presented in the epistle. How lamentable that the Spanish Rabbi should add the remark that immediately follows: " But this is repugnant to the fundamental principle which we believe, that the law is perpetual

εἰς θεόν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μοι εἰς 11 λαόν. Καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν πολίτην αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων· γνῶθι τὸν κύριον· ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσί με ἀπὸ 12 μικροῦ αὐτῶν ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν. Ὅτι ἵλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν

will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they 11 shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest: For I will be merci- 12 ful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I

---

and immutable." One would think that a sensible and candid mind would therefore feel compelled to doubt, whether such a supposed fundamental principle has any better support than long cherished prejudice.*

"I took them by the hand:" This is a beautiful figure expressive of the tenderest affection. It is drawn from the care of a parent or kind nurse devoting attention to a weak child, who requires to be taken by the hand, and assisted in its feeble endeavours to walk. We have the same idea in 1 Thess. ii. 7, "We were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children." Also in the introduction of St. Paul's discourse in the Synagogue of Pisidia, although it does not appear in the received Greek text, Acts xiii. 18. A change of a single letter, and one of the same organ as that changed, alters the meaning from "suffered their manners," as it appears in our English translation, to 'tenderly cherished them.' This change is sustained by the strongest external authority, and the language in Deut. i. 31 in the Septuagint strengthens the evidence in support of it. The reader will not fail to remark the difference between the meaning of the expression here employed and that in Ezekiel, "I lifted up my hand to them," xx. 5, 6, 15, 23; which is equivalent to swearing, the raising of the hand being usual in taking an oath.—"And I regarded them not:" The Apostle here as generally elsewhere follows the Septuagint. The literal translation of the Hebrew is: "though I was a husband to them." It has been conjectured that the Greek translators read the text somewhat differently, having in their copies the guttural *cheth* instead of *ayin*. It has also been said both by Jewish and Christian expositors, that some such idea as they have given may be derived even from the present Hebrew text; and if this be so, it should suggest a caution to critics not to alter the Masoretic reading except in extreme cases. But that the original word rendered, "I was a husband" can bear such a sense, is denied by Hengstenberg, and apparently on good grounds. See his Christology, Keith's translation, vol. iii. p. 376–380. As the relevancy of the quotation to the author's purpose does not at all depend on the accuracy of the Greek version here employed in this particular text, it is unnecessary to defend

* See Jewish Rabbies, p. 196.

13 remember no more. In that he saith, A new *covenant*, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old *is* ready to vanish away.

IX. Then verily the first *covenant* had also ordinances of divine service, and

αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι. Ἐν τῷ λέγειν, καινὴν· πεπαλαίωκε τὴν πρώτην· τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ. 13

Εἶχε μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη δικαιώματα λατρείας, τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν. IX.

---

it.—“All shall know me,” &c. This may either be a prediction of a *general* extension of Christian knowledge, in which case *all* must be understood with suitable limitations, as is usual; or it may express *universality.* If so, the prophecy will be cumulative, in part already verified but hereafter to be fully accomplished.—The entire oblivion of sins is the crowning point of the prediction, and is afterwards referred to by our author as a blessing attainable only through Christ.

13. The application of the term *new* to the better dispensation suggests the remark in this verse. The prophet thereby implies that the former had grown old; and, like an antiquated and worn-out thing, was approaching its final dissolution.

ix. 1. Οὖν, “then” or *therefore*, may be connected with the preceding verse. Having spoken of the old dispensation as done away, the author may now mention its religious appliances as things which it once possessed, but which are no more in existence. But most probably its logical connection is with the idea expressed in viii. 5, namely, that the dispensation was a representation of the future, as in this chapter it is more fully developed. It was typical in its character, and *therefore* has corresponding arrangements and services. In the English the word *covenant* is exegetical, and has been added by the translators. The reading σκηνή is not genuine, and the adjective “first” relates to the dispensation before mentioned.

“A worldly sanctuary:” literally, ‘the sanctuary, a worldly one.’ Bishop Middleton, in his work on the Greek Article, maintains that κοσμικόν is the noun and ἅγιον the adjective, and that the meaning is “holy splendour.” But this is quite improbable, as no good reason can be given why the author should use a Rabbinical noun made up from a Greek adjective, when the Greek language would so readily have supplied him with a suitable word to express the intended idea. Besides, the adjective “worldly” is evidently in contradistinction to “heavenly” and “not made with hands” in vs. 23, 24. “The sanctuary” is, most probably, a general term comprehending the holy place and the most holy, the temple, or rather in this connection, the tabernacle properly so called, exclusive of its outer courts. But why is it said to be “worldly?” If the author of this epistle had been the narrow-minded Jew, hunting up far-fetched and unsupported analogies, such as those which abound in the so-called epistle of Barnabas, he would eagerly have embraced so favourable an opportunity as is here presented

2 Σκηνὴ γὰρ κατεσκευάσθη ἡ πρώτη, ἐν a worldly sanctuary. For there was 2

---

to indulge his imagination. In that case, we should undoubtedly have had some if not all of the extravagances of Josephus and Philo, and perhaps, of the earlier Rabbies. Josephus employs his own symbolical expositions as the ground of a eulogy on Moses. The whole tabernacle he divides into three parts, two of which were for the priests in general and common to all. These represent the earth and the sea. He refers to the holy place, which, either by an inadvertence or in order to enable him to carry out his analogy, he separates into two parts, though it was all one room twice as large as the most holy. The twelve loaves of the show bread denote the twelve months of the year. It would be difficult to trace any analogy except in the number. The seven lamps of the candlestick denote the seven planets. The veil woven with four differently colored materials represents the four elements: the linen is the earth which produces flax; the purple the sea, from the colour of the blood of the cocle-fish; the violet and scarlet the air and fire.* The reader who is inclined to examine may see much more matter equally edifying. Clement of Alexandria also speaks to the same purpose in his Stromata, Lib. v. p. 562, Edit. Sylburg. Tholuck, in his note on the eighth verse of this chapter, gives a brief statement of the allegorical interpretation of Philo and others. Cardinal Hugo indulges in the same strain. The reader will certainly be amused by reading, and may be instructed by reflecting on, the quotation that follows. "The holy place signifies the church militant, or the soul in its present miserable state of exile. The holy of holies signifies the church triumphant or the soul reigning with Christ." He then proceeds to draw out analogies of a tabernacle or tent with the church. "It can be carried from place to place; and the church advances from virtue to virtue. In this tent, which is the church, Sisera is put to death, that is the Devil, by the nail of divine power and the hammer of divine flagellation. The tabernacle has various skins; the red signifies the martyrs, the hyacinth the confessors, the curtains the virgins, and the coarser coverings the penitents." Then we have the candlestick, the table of show bread, and the altar of incense, likened to the beginners, the more advanced, and the more perfect in the church. These again are adumbrated by Lazarus, Martha and Mary (!) "Lazarus, who rises from darkness to light, denotes the penitents or those in an incipient state, who need the candlestick of divine illumination; Martha signifies the more advanced and active, who set out a table for the Lord and refresh him in his poor members; and Mary symbolizes the perfect and contemplative Christians, who offer themselves to God in sweetness of odour, and therefore are compared to the altar on which aromatic perfumes were burned. Or else the candlestick

* Antiquities, Lib. iii. Cap. vii, Edit. Hud. pp. 115, 116.

a tabernacle made, the first, wherein ᾗ ἥ τε λυχνία καὶ ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ

---

stands for doctors of the church," &c., &c., &c. The reader who will take the trouble may find a vast deal more of the same sort of allegorical and ingenious trifling. If he will candidly and seriously and religiously compare it with our inspired author's most wise and holy and dignified silence, he may learn a practical lesson of deep import. The analogies furnished in this epistle are natural and point to some important truth. It is vain to say that the author does himself give a reason for omitting what he might otherwise have been inclined to expatiate on, namely, that he could not at present "speak particularly" or in detail. Had he been embued with the allegorizing disposition, he would not have failed to find time, and his subject would have given him occasion to speak "out of the abundance of his heart." The remarks of Maurice on this point are so judicious that every intelligent person will be gratified to peruse them.

"Let the reader calmly compare this epistle with any of the books, Jewish or Christian, which are confessedly allegorical, and I shall be very much surprised if he is not struck with something more than a difference, with a direct opposition between them. I will give two instances merely as hints; they might be multiplied indefinitely. The writer of the epistle, in alluding to the temple worship, mentions the cherubim and the mercy seat. Of these he says, We cannot now speak particularly. Could any allegorist have resisted the temptation to speak most particularly on these subjects? Would not every circumstance of their form and position have furnished the text for endless analogies and spiritual applications? The writer of the epistle spends a whole chapter upon the faith of the elders of the Jewish nation. That faith is illustrated by their common acts, their ordinary daily history. Abraham lives in tents, and waits for a son; is ready to offer him up. Moses is hid three months by his parents; refuses to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. Could an allegorist have endured such vulgar events as these?" The author means, would he not have amplified the supposed spiritual bearing of such ordinary occurrences? "Would he not have dwelt on the significance of the names of the patriarchs? Would not each act of their lives have been treated as remarkable, because it was the type of something divine or something future? And generally it may be affirmed that this writer, instead of seeking for shadows, is impatient of them; he is always desirous to translate them into something practical and substantial."*

To return to the text. The term "worldly" is undoubtedly applied to the Hebrew tabernacle in order to denote its inferiority compared with that of Christianity, which, properly speaking, is identical with heaven

* The Epistle to the Hebrews; the Substance of Three Lectures. By F. D. Maurice, M. A. London, 1847, pp. 37, 38.

πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, ἥτις λέγεται ἅγια.
3 *Μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα σκηνὴ*
4 *ἡ λεγομένη ἅγια ἁγίων, χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης περικεκαλυμμένην πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ, ἐν ᾗ στάμνος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ*

was the candlestick, and the table, and the show-bread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the sec- 3 ond veil, the tabernacle, which is called the holiest of all; which had 4 the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about

---

itself. The references before made to viii. 5, and ix. 11, 23, 24, show this to be the meaning. The Apostle calls it *worldly*, because the *heavenly* truth was but imperfectly known to those who were associated with it. Elsewhere in St. Paul's writings we have illustrations of this meaning. Thus the phrase in Galatians, "the elements of *the world*," identical with "the weak and beggarly elements," iv. 3, 9, is expressive of an imperfect religion, chiefly of an external character, adapted to the grosser, less spiritual condition, and therefore in a degree worldly, weak, trifling, mere rudiments as it were of religious education. And so in Colossians, "the rudiments" or elements "of the world" are merely ritual observances, external services of religion, ii. 20. It is not thereby implied that the Mosaic system, although in its essential characteristics external, was therefore positively unworthy; but only that it was imperfect. And this it may have been, while at the same time it was the best for that age and for the condition of the people to whom it was given. In analogy with this use of language, our Saviour denominates the less mysterious truths of his system "earthly," in contradistinction to the more profound, which he calls "heavenly;" and John the Baptist in evident allusion to the inferiority of his own mission to that of Christ, uses the terms "earth" and "earthly." John iii. 12, 31. Comp. also, in this epistle, xii. 25, "on earth," used of Moses in contrast with Christ "from heaven."

2. "The show bread:" literally, 'the placing before of the bread' or 'loaves,' equivalent to 'the loaves placed before;' like "the land of thy destruction," for 'thy destroyed land,' in Isa. xlix. 19. The twelve loaves are so called because, according to the requisition of the law, they were placed on the holy table in the sanctuary, and therefore before the divine presence. The Hebrew phrase is, 'the bread of the faces' or the presence, the plural being used by way of eminence. The supposition that the loaves were so called on account of their position, six on one fixture facing the other six on another, is trifling, and without any analogy with the symbolical character of the whole Hebrew system.

3. The second veil, that which divided the outer room from the inner.

4. The word *θυμιατήριον* is correctly rendered "censer" in our translation, as also in all the older English versions. It occurs in this meaning in 2 Chron. xxvi. 19, and Ezek. viii. 11, Septuagint. It frequently signifies

with gold, wherein *was* the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's

μάννα καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἡ βλαστήσασα καὶ αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης,

---

'altar of incense,' and is so translated here by not a few interpreters. Thus Jahn, in his Archæology, Section 333, note; who, maintaining that the epistle was written in Hebrew, presumes this to be an errour of the translator. But as the theory of the Hebrew origin is not sustained, there is of course no ground for his inference. That such a translator should have committed so great a blunder as to put the altar of incense in the most holy place, when it appertained to the holy, is almost as improbable as to suppose that the author himself could have been guilty of such an oversight. Owen contends that the altar is meant. He remarks, that the author "says not that it was in the second tabernacle, but that *it had it.* And it may well be said to have the altar, because the high-priest could never enter into that place nor perform any service in it, but he was to bring incense with him, taken in a censer from this altar." But this is trifling. The thing denoted by the word is connected with the ark and rod and manna, and the second tabernacle "had" or contained all, and doubtless in the same sense. It has been said, that a writer so minute and carefully accurate as the author of this epistle would not have omitted the altar of incense. But he did not intend to mention every thing appertaining to these divine places, and he says he could not speak of them particularly. Under these circumstances, we cannot admit the argument from an omission. Josephus, in recounting the various things seen by Pompey in the holy place, makes the same omission. Tholuck, who in his note on this text mentions the fact, puts the very pertinent question, was he unacquainted with the position of the altar of incense? This is not to be supposed. St. John's Gospel contains no account of the institution of the Lord's Supper. The law, it is true, does not state that the censer was kept in the most holy place, but as it was used by the high-priest on the day of expiation and on no other occasion, no place can be imagined more suitable for depositing this holy instrument of sacred service. See Levit. xvi. 12. According to the Rabbinical accounts, a particular censer was used on the day of expiation, and on the morning of that day it was taken into the most holy place and left fuming with its incense until the evening. Therefore, at least as long as the incense was being consumed in the course of the service of the day, the censer must have remained in the most holy place. Even this limited continuance is sufficient to enable us to explain the Apostle's language.* Archdeacon Wilberforce attempts to remove this imaginary difficulty by a process which I believe is perfectly original.

* See a dissertation by Wilkins on the high-priest's sacerdotal action in the most holy place, Functio Pontificis Maximi in Adyto, in the Thesaurus Theologico-Philologicus, Amst. 1702, p. 760.

5 ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς χερουβὶμ δόξης κα-

rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cher- 5

"Let it be considered, that the writer was contemplating the Jewish service through that reality which it was intended to represent, and therefore that he viewed the offerings which were laid upon God's altar as they might be viewed after the veil was taken away in Christ, and the altar of incense would, in truth, pertain to the mercy seat before which it was placed, and to the outer sanctuary in which it was situate."* This is altogether a mistake. It must be plain to any unbiased reader that the author of the epistle is describing the two rooms *as they were in the Jewish tabernacle under the Mosaic dispensation before the veil was taken away;* and this, in order to draw out the analogy between the typical action of the high-priest on the day of atonement in the most holy place, and Christ's action after having gone into heaven itself. Things as *they then were* are set in contrast with things *that were afterwards to be developed.*

"In which:" Does the author mean in the ark, or in the most holy place? Certain difficulties arising out of the former alternative, have induced some writers to maintain the latter. This may have been the view of the Syriac translator, who renders the whole verse thus: 'And *there was in it* the golden censer and the ark of the covenant which was all overlaid with gold; and *there was in it* the golden pot,' &c. But the next verse is against this theory, for the cherubim of glory are said to have been over it, meaning evidently the ark and not the most holy place. It is possible indeed that "*it*" may relate to the covenant, διαθήκη, just mentioned, that is, the two tables, which are so called in 1 Kings viii. 21, above which the figures stretching over the ark† may well be said to be: but this is very improbable. It would seem therefore that it is the ark which is meant. But is it true that the pot of manna and the rod that budded were deposited in the ark? There is a Jewish tradition to this effect mentioned by Abarbanel in his commentary on 1 Kings viii. 9. But the contracted dimensions of the ark, two and a half cubits long by one and a half broad and high, (Exod. xxv. 10,) would seem to be too small to contain those articles together with the tablets themselves. The book of the law also is directed to be deposited therein, (Deut. xxxi. 26,) and the Philistines are said to place certain golden offerings in a coffer by its side, (1 Sam. vi. 8, 11.) But the manna and the rod were to be placed "in the tabernacle before the testimony, before the Lord:" Exod. xvi. 33, 34, Num. xvii. 4, 7, 9, 10. Professor Stuart regards this as equivalent to a command to put them "in the ark." See his 17th Excursus. But this by no means follows,

* The doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ in its relation to mankind and to the Church. By Robert Isaac Wilberforce, &c., &c. Phila. H. Hooker, 1849, p. 204, note.

† Exod. xxv. 18 et seq.

ubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat: of which we cannot now speak particularly. 6 Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the

τασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλαστήριον, περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἔστι νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος. 6 Τούτων δὲ οὕτω κατεσκευασμένων, εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν διαπαντὸς εἰσίασιν

---

and the most natural exposition of the language is that they were deposited in the most holy place in front of and probably close to the ark which contained the two tables. Rabbi Levi Ben Gerson objects that, in this case, the language in Num. xvii. 10, should be not " before the testimony," but 'before the ark.' But this is of little weight, as the testimony, or tables of the law deposited in the ark, are the prominent points in the author's mind and therefore emphatic. The view above given agrees with 1 Kings viii. 9, from which it appears that in Solomon's time the ark contained nothing but these tables. If, as some have thought, the pot of manna and the rod had originally been attached by suitable receptacles to the ark, it is not improbable that they may have been lost during the period antecedent to the building of the temple, especially as the ark had been subjected by its frequent removals to various exposures. In this case they may be said to have been in it, as articles deposited in the top of a trunk, are in it. We must either adopt some such theory as this, or give to the preposition ἐν another meaning than *in;* either *near*, according to Bochart* and others, or according to Wilkins,† *with*. In this latter sense it is repeatedly used elsewhere, in proof of which it may be sufficient to refer to ver. 25, ἐν αἵματι, *with* blood. This last solution will appear to be the less improbable, if we admit that the pot and the rod were placed very near to the ark.

5. The mercy seat or propitiatory, that is, the golden cover of the ark. See Exod. xxv. 17, 21, in the Septuagint. The tables which contained God's moral law to man indicated his duty. The law having been broken by men's universal delinquency, the sprinkling of the blood of atonement upon the mercy seat indicated propitiation and consequent forgiveness to the penitent.

6. "These things:" Or rather, these, meaning the two tabernacles, with their various appurtenances, having been thus constructed. Comp. ver. 2, where the Greek verb is the same.

7. "Once;" that is, on one day; for on that occasion, the services required the high-priest to enter into the most holy place several times. "Errours:" literally ignorances, meaning sins in general. See on v. 2.

8. "Holiest," that is heaven: For the use of the plural see on viii. 2.— "First tabernacle was yet standing:" Some have understood the word "tabernacle" here figuratively for the Mosaic dispensation. But the word is never so used in the New Testament. It denotes the whole building, com-

* Hieroz. Par. I. Lib. ii. cap. 50, col. 590. † Ubi sup. p. 759.

οἱ ἱερεῖς τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες,
7 εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος, ὃ προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ
8 λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων· τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν, ἔτι τῆς
9 πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν· ἥτις παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστη-

first tabernacle, accomplishing the service *of God.* But into the sec- 7 ond *went* the high-priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and *for* the errours of the people: the Holy 8 Ghost this signifying, That the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing. Which *was* a figure for the time 9

---

prehending the holy place and the most holy, as in Acts vii. 44, Heb. viii. 5, ix. 21, xiii. 10, (comp. Exod. xxv. xxvi. xxvii.:) or one of these two places, as in ix. 2, 3, 6. "The first tabernacle" in this verse is evidently identical with that mentioned in vs. 6 and 2, and therefore the meaning must be, 'during the continuance of the holy place.' The author may allude to the rending of the veil of the temple, by which the most holy place was made accessible, thus indicating the admission therein of all the "royal priesthood" of whom St. Peter speaks in his first epistle, ii. 9. In this case, the first tabernacle would no longer subsist but have become one with the second. His statement will be equivalent to saying, 'while the first dispensation lasted,' but the word tabernacle will retain its settled meaning; and it is important to note this in reference to the true sense of ver. 11.

Three points are here particularly worthy of notice. First, the arrangements for the Hebrew service referred to are ascribed to the Holy Spirit; consequently their divine origin is implied. Secondly, they are said to have been intended to indicate a most important truth; their symbolical and typical character therefore is affirmed. Thirdly, the truth which the legal institution here mentioned was designed to teach is, not that during the Mosaic dispensation there was no knowledge of a future state of happiness or of the method of attaining it, but only that the way to it was not yet made manifest. And thus in 2 Tim. i. 10, St. Paul speaks of the Gospel as bringing "life and immortality to light," making that clear and perspicuous which before was obscure or indistinct.

9, 10. The second point just noted is here expressly affirmed; the former dispensation was typical. Commentators have differed on the point, whether the time referred to were that of the Jewish or Christian dispensation. In the latter case, the translation would be, '*until* the present time,' a sense which the preposition is well known to bear, and instead of ὅν, in *which*, we must read ἥν, which has very respectable external support, its antecedent being παραβολή, *figure*, that is, the dispensation so represented. The present tense, "are offered," would be merely historical

then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the con-
10 science; *which stood* only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed *on them* until the time of reformation.

κότα, καθ' ὃν δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα, μόνον 10 ἐπὶ βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς, δικαιώματα σαρκὸς μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα. Χριστὸς 11 δὲ παραγενόμενος, ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν

---

and involve no difficulty. But most probably the true meaning is given in our English translation, "the time then present," the period of the Jewish dispensation. The idea may then be expressed as follows: so long as it continued it was figurative and typical. *This time* will then be in contradistinction to "*the time of reformation*," or of the Gospel mentioned afterwards. For the remainder of the verse see on v. 1, and vii. 11.—Instead of "*which stood*" introduced in our English version, I would substitute, *being*, a common ellipsis, and for "in," *along with* or *in addition to*, a very usual meaning of ἐπί. With "meats and drinks" compare Col. ii. 16. The reference is to food as prescribed by the law, and not to offerings, for which the original words are never used. The word "and," καί, after *washings*, is generally regarded by critics as not genuine, being wanting in some of the best ancient authorities. Whether δικαιώμασι or δικαιώματα be the true reading is doubtful. Tholuck gives reasons for preferring the latter. If the former be retained, it must be grammatically connected with the preceding words: if the other, it will be in apposition with "gifts," δῶρα, in ver. 9. Should it be objected, that the feminine gender might be expected in order to correspond with δυνάμεναι, which agrees with θυσίαι, it were easy to understand πραγμάτα *things*. The result in either case gives the same general idea. According to the dative reading, the translation and punctuation of the whole verse will run thus: '*Being* only—along with meats, and drinks, and various washings, fleshly ordinances —*things* imposed until the time of reformation.' With the nominative it will be thus: '*Being* only—along with meats and drinks and various washings—fleshly ordinances imposed until the time of reformation.'

11, 12. The author, having stated such typical particulars of the Mosaic dispensation as were necessary for his immediate purpose, now proceeds to point out their perfect spiritual development and truthful reality in the sacrificial action of Christ.—"Good things to come;" meaning Gospel blessings to be enjoyed both here and hereafter, all of which constitute one great whole. Comp. x. 1.—"Greater and more perfect tabernacle." These words have been variously interpreted. Many commentators have understood them of Christ's natural body. The word *tabernacle* or *tent* was applied both by Jewish and philosophical writers to the human body, on account of its being the frail and temporary residence

μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς, οὐ χειροποιή-του, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως,	But Christ being come, a high-priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle,	11

---

of the soul. See 2 Cor. v. 1, 2, and Wisdom of Sol. ix. 15. The words that follow—"not made with hands, that is, not of this creation"—indicate superiority to ordinary earthly and material productions. Thus, in Col. ii. 11, "the circumcision of Christ, *not made with hands*," is in contradistinction to Jewish circumcision, which was imperfect and merely external; and in 2 Cor. v. 1, the same word is employed to describe the superiority of the Christian's resurrection-body to his present one. According to this view, Christ will be represented as entering into heaven with his own body, in which he had made atonement. See x. 10. But against this exposition, it may be sufficient to remark, that the very same idea is contained in the phrase of the next verse, "by his own blood;" and it is not probable that so vapid a repetition would be made by such a writer as the author of this epistle. It has also been said that "the greater and more perfect tabernacle" is heaven itself contrasted with the Mosaic tabernacle, and "through" it has been explained elliptically for "by means of what is done in it," that is, the presentation of Christ's offering and his intercession. But this is open to the same objection as the other, "by his own blood" implying the very thing here stated.—Again, the words "good things to come" have been conjoined with those that follow without any separating punctuation, and the supposed thought of the apostle expressed thus: 'high-priest of the future good things *which are* through the greater and more perfect tabernacle.' Thus the word *tabernacle* will be figurative for the Christian dispensation, as some have thought it to be in ver. 8 for the Hebrew. The sense thus elicited is certainly a good one, but such a meaning of the word is unsupported by usage and against the immediate context, which shews that "the tabernacle," has an analogy to the material Jewish one before spoken of. See note on ver. 8.

The analogy which the author has in mind, and which he draws out in vs. 24, 25, between the Jewish high-priest's action on the day of atonement and that of Christ, suggests another view which seems preferable. In order to perform the duties of the day of expiation, the Jewish high-priest *passed through* the outer sanctuary into the inner or most holy place, thus coming close to the very symbol of the divine presence, the consecrated ark overshadowed by the cherubim. The apostle therefore represents Christ as having passed through what may be called the outer celestial region into the inmost heaven, where the Infinite and Eternal continually pours out on all sides the abundance of his benefactions. Not that the mind of a man so thoroughly spiritual thinks of a "cœlum äerium et ætherium," in the words of Rosenmueller, through which Christ is

not made with hands, that is to say, 12 not of this building, neither by the

οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων, 12

---

supposed to pass, or indeed of any created locality. But, adapting his mode of expression to the arrangement and construction of the typical tabernacles which suggest his analogy, the apostle speaks as if Christ had passed through an outer heaven into an inner one; while the whole idea intended to be conveyed is, that he has gone directly into the most intimate presence of the ever blessed God. It is worthy of note that the venerable Syriac translation contents itself with giving this main thought, identifying "the tabernacle not made with hands" with the place into which Christ entered. Its meaning is thus correctly expressed by Dr. Murdock. "But the Messiah who came was a high-priest of the good things which he wrought; and he entered into the great and perfect tabernacle, which was not made with hands and was not of these created things. And he did not enter with the blood of goats and calves, but with the blood of himself he entered once into the sanctuary and obtained eternal redemption." If a more particular analogy should be thought necessary, it may be said that the less glorious heavenly condition may correspond with the holy place, and the highest and most glorious with the holy of holies. The reflecting and spiritual reader, however, will pass on from the method of representation to the thing represented. He will think little or nothing of the garb in comparison with the glorious idea therein invested. Nor will he feel any more difficulty in allowing the use of such language to express the intended thought, than in understanding various other language of holy Scripture. Let one instance close at hand supply the place of multitudes which might easily be adduced. In ver. 12 Christ is said to enter into heaven "*with his own blood*," and this in contradistinction to that of "*goats and calves*," used as expiatory under the Mosaic dispensation. Now we are told that "*flesh and blood* cannot inherit the kingdom of God," 1 Cor. xv. 50. But what reader of any spirituality of mind does not lose sight of the literal meaning and grasp that which is evidently intended, namely, that he entered heaven with the advantage of that atonement, which the shedding of his blood on the cross had already obtained for guilty man. And yet the idea is expressed in terms taken from the priestly action of carrying blood literally into the most holy place.

Tholuck regards the phrase as equivalent to heaven in its full sense, and the place said to be entered not as "heaven itself as at ver. 24, but something lying beyond heaven." This view would accord with viii. 2, where "the sanctuary," τὰ ἅγια, and "the true tabernacle," σκηνὴ ἡ ἀληθινή, seem to be identical, and it might be held notwithstanding what is afterwards stated, that Christ appears for us "*in* heaven itself." For he is

διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, εἰσῆλθεν	blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into

---

also said to have "passed *through* the heavens," to have become "*higher* than the heavens," to have "ascended far *above all* heavens," iv. 14, vii. 26, Eph. iv. 10. The possession of infinite dignity, glory and bliss, is the idea conveyed by all these expressions, not merely elevation to some definite locality. Still, as the word "tabernacle" is just before used for the Mosaic holy place, the outer room alone, vs. 2, 6, 8, with which "the more perfect" one here mentioned is contrasted, and since in connection with the train of thought Christ is soon afterwards said to "appear for us *in* heaven," the analogy as before represented is preferable.

A friend, distinguished for his classical attainments, has objected that, in such cases the medium with the preposition is commonly placed after the verb expressive of entrance, or if before it, with a view to emphasis. Good writers, both classical and Hellenistic, do employ either collocation. If the latter is always adopted in order to be emphatic, the principle may be said to be particularly applicable here, heaven being emphatically great and perfect, and the design of the writer being to set forth most emphatically the dignity of Christ's priestly action. He has evidently contracted his sentence oratorically, and so as to make the most favourable impression. It was also objected by the same learned authority that, according to my view or that of Tholuck, *διά* must be taken in different senses in the same context. But I think it is a satisfactory answer, that its connection with the nouns which it governs, sufficiently explains the meaning, and that the same word is often variously used in the same sentence. Were one to say, 'in going to my place of destination, I travelled by the steamer by certain towns and villages,' although the sentence would not indeed be very elegant, yet no one could mistake the two meanings of the one preposition. Besides, the separation of the first *διά* from the second and third by the intervening clauses, ought to be considered as diminishing the weight of such an objection.

Another learned friend has suggested a view of the text which I here present to the reader's consideration, although I cannot acquiesce in it. He considers the whole of our Lord's earthly sojourn, comprehending also his body in which it was passed, and what he did in the body especially during his ministerial life, as the greater and more perfect tabernacle. He argues, that "if it be once admitted that the termination of our Lord's earthly life, that is, the ascension, was the period of his entrance into the holy of holies, it follows that 'the greater and more perfect tabernacle' must be found between his entrance into our world and his departure from it." He considers therefore "the whole of this time or space as the better taber-

the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us.* For if — ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος. Εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα ταύρων 13

---

nacle," with a "more particular reference to Christ's public ministry, as that part of his life which more immediately concerns us." But this view appears to me irreconcilable with the Apostle's analogy between the worldly and the heavenly sanctuaries, the Mosaic and the celestial tabernacles. The latter are manifestly heaven or in heaven, as the former are undeniably earthly and on earth. A state or condition or course of action of Christ while living in Palestine, does not keep up the idea of such analogy. He is called in the introductory part of this section, viii. 2, "a minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man," and this would seem to be identical with or at least comprehensive of "the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building," of the text. But certainly the Apostle does not mean to tell us, that Christ was a minister of his own body or course of earthly sojourn. The argument of my valued friend presumes that we are bound to find some locality or condition through which Christ passed into the heavenly holy of holies, which corresponds with the Mosaic outer tabernacle. But this seems to me unnecessary, the whole thought being, as I have before said, simply this, that Christ has gone into the most intimate presence of God; or, beyond the less into the most glorious celestial condition.

"Once:" The meaning and bearing of this term will be considered on ver. 20.—"Eternal:" This is in evident contrast to the imperfect and temporary efficacy of the Jewish atonements.

The idea of the two verses may be given thus: 'But when Christ came, the high-priest of the future good things, he entered beyond any conceivable celestial mansion into the very inmost heaven, not with such inefficacious propitiation as the Mosaic dispensation could furnish, but with that infinitely acceptable one which his own sufferings and death had made, and which he pronounced to be once for all completed, when he uttered the memorable words: "It is finished!"'

13, 14. "Blood of bulls and goats:" This refers to the high-priest's offerings for himself and household, and also for the people on the day of atonement. See Levit. xvi. 6, 14, 15.—"Ashes of a heifer:" In allusion to the preparation of water to be sprinkled on the unclean, which was made by infusing the ashes of a red heifer, as directed in Num. xix. 2, et seq.—"Through the eternal spirit:" In place of *eternal*, αἰωνίου, some authorities read *holy*, ἁγίου. But the former is doubtless the true reading, as the weight of external evidence is decidedly in its favour, and the meaning of the whole phrase cannot possibly demand any other. It is not easy to determine what this meaning is. Tholuck, with great propriety and force,

καὶ τράγων καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως ῥαντίζουσα τοὺς κεκοινωμένους ἁγιάζει πρὸς 14 τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα, πόσῳ μᾶλ-

the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more 14

---

severely censures certain conceited persons, who suppose the Apostle to have employed language without any clear conception of his own meaning. "Some interpreters, mistaking their own impotency of understanding for that of their author, have complained of the Apostle Paul, that he did not really understand his own meaning. See Rueckert on Rom. vii. 14. A person named Welcker has fallen into a delusion somewhat similar, when treating of the expression in our epistle. It is a grievous evil when the arrogance of an interpreter of Holy Scripture gives out his own bankruptcy as that of his author." Locke some where makes a remark to this effect: 'If any one thinks St. Paul to be a loose writer, it is only a proof that he is a loose reader.' But the class of men whom the English philosopher and theologian and the profound German scholar and divine have in view, have no right perception of the limited degree of their own abilities.

There are two leading views of this phrase, either of which may be defended. The first retains the usual signification of Spirit, namely, the Holy Ghost. Thus the meaning will be, that Christ offered himself to God by the promptings and influence of the Spirit. Although the New Testament does not expressly affirm this in relation to his sacrifice, yet such a representation is entirely in harmony with Christ's whole life and character. It had been predicted that he should be richly endowed with the Spirit, Isa. xi. 2, lxi. 1; his very birth was the result of the Spirit's miraculous agency, Matt. i. 18, 20, Luke i. 35; the Spirit descended on him at his baptism and remained, Matt. iii. 16, John i. 32, 33; by the influence of the Spirit he went to be tempted, Matt. iv. 1; by the Spirit he wrought miracles, Matt. xii. 18, 28, Acts x. 38, and performed certain ministrations, Acts i. 2; and the Spirit was given to him without measure, John iii. 34. Who can doubt then, that this offering was made by or in accordance with the influence of the same Spirit? And although the usual epithet applied to the Spirit is *holy*, yet the Apostle may here have preferred the substitute *eternal*, in order to make it harmonize with the leading thought of the whole context, particularly as expressed in the preceding verse, the *perpetual* efficacy of Christ's one sacrifice. The common translation, therefore, agrees with the meaning of the words, and with scriptural analogy.

Still, the original phrase does certainly bear another meaning which agrees well with the context and immediate scope. The words *spirit* and *spiritual* are often employed to denote what is superior, excellent, perfect, divine. For example: "spiritual meat and drink—born according to the spirit—spiritual body—quickening spirit—it is the spirit that quickeneth."

shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered	λον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμω-

See 1 Cor. x. 3, 4, Gal. iv. 29, 1 Cor. xv. 44, 45, John vi. 63. The text which bears most directly on the view under consideration is Rom. i. 4. Here "the spirit of holiness" can hardly mean the Holy Spirit. The phrase would indeed accord exactly with the Hebrew one for Holy Spirit, yet the New Testament never uses it to express this divine agent, and its evident antithesis with "according to the flesh" requires another meaning, namely, Christ's divine nature in connection with his glorified humanity in that condition of honour and happiness which he resumed on his ascension and session at God's right hand. Thus, his being marked out conspicuously as God's Son in power is set in contradistinction to his having been the son of David according to the flesh, that is, in his incarnate state of humiliation. And so in the text, the apostle probably uses *spirit* in the same sense of Christ's glorified condition, the state of his advancement in human nature to universal supremacy, which condition of his is eternal. *Through*, διά, that is, by means of, by the efficacy of, as in ver. 12, by the efficacy of his own blood. According to this view, the efficacy of Christ's atoning, reconciling, and intercessory course of action, will be represented in connection with his all-glorious and everlasting life in heaven. Comp. on vii. 25.

"*Dead* works:" This may be in allusion, as many have supposed, to the circumstance, that the ashes before mentioned were especially intended to cleanse those who had been defiled by a *dead* body. Thus the word will be figurative and express the idea of pollution, sinfulness. Or it may merely denote the *deadly* effects of sinful works. Probably both meanings may be combined.

According to either of the above views, the author's argument stands thus. 'If the sacrifice of brute animals was sufficiently satisfactory to produce external purification, how much rather shall that of Christ, who, by the promptings of the Spirit, or, in a perpetually glorious and elevated condition, presented to God the merits of his sacrifice, satisfy the conscience, and purify the whole inner man from sin, thus preparing the heart to serve God acceptably.' On the theory of the mere humanity of Christ, I must profess that I can see no force at all in the argument. Yet it is stated as one *a fortiori*, and which every reader is presumed to feel and admit. To give it any weight, it is necessary to regard Christ as a being possessing a nature vastly superior to human. On the only true and scriptural theory, that of his divinity and humanity combined, the force of the reasoning is irresistible.

15. "And for this cause," *therefore*, as the Greek is usually rendered: Because of the infinitely superior efficacy of Christ's sacrifice to those of the preceding dispensation. "New:" In addition to the idea neces-

μου τῷ ϑεῷ, καϑαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν 15 ϑεῷ ζῶντι. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαϑήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν, ὅπως, ϑανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ

himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? And for this 15 cause he is the Mediator of the new testament, that by means of death,

---

sarily expressed by this term, it probably conveys also that of superior excellence, as "old" in viii. 13, suggests that of feebleness and decay. Thus the word seems to be used in the following places: "a new song," Ps. xxxiii. 3, Rev. v. 9, xiv. 3; "a new man," Rev. ii. 17; "drink it new," Matt. xxvi. 29. Virgil also employs *novus* and *novum* in the same way. See Æneid, iv. 10, and Ecl. iii. 86, and v. 71.—Christ's death is said to deliver from sins committed under the former, that is, the Jewish dispensation, in order to intimate to the Hebrew reader, that perfect acquittal from the punishment and moral effects of sin, was not the result of the Jewish sacrifices in themselves, but of that one great and only effectual sacrifice of Christ which they typified. The same thought is given in Rom. iii. 25, "for the remission of sins that are past;" and this proves, not the identity of authorship of the two epistles, but certainly a striking harmony in both. —The *death* mentioned is, of course, that of Christ; the *redemption* is complete deliverance from; and *the called* are those who have accepted the invitation of the Gospel which had been made to them. Comp. Rom. i. 6, viii. 28, 1 Cor. i. 24, vii. 17, 18, 20–22.—The epithet *eternal* repeats the idea before expressed of the *perpetuity* of the effects of Christ's atonement, in contradistinction to the *temporary* imperfect results of Hebrew sacrifices.

16, 17. The connection and meaning of these verses are not clear. Commentators are divided on the point whether the original word διαϑήκη, which has been repeatedly used before, means here covenant, that is, dispensation, or testament, that is, will. I shall endeavour to lay before the reader the views of both parties.

There is no doubt that testament or will is a well supported classical signification of the term, and that the whole clause is faithfully rendered according to good Greek usage in our English translation. And the particulars here specified are certainly all in accordance with those naturally associated with a last will and testament. Such a document, in order to be legal and effectual, necessarily implies that the testator has died. It is only of persons deceased that it has any force, as the testator, while living, retains his property and may alter his will as he pleases: διαϑήκη—ϑάνατον ἀνάγκη—νεκροῖς—ὁ διαϑέμενος—are all in harmony with the opinion that the author has in mind a will, whereby the owner of property disposes after his death of what belongs to him. And the figure is in exact accordance with the facts. There is a will or testament, Christ's publicly expressed determination, fully authenticated by competent witnesses, to bequeath certain advan-

for the redemption of the transgressions *that were* under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal 16 inheritance. For where a testament *is*, there must also of necessity be 17 the death of the testator. For a

πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας. Ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη, 16 θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου· διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, 17

---

tageous legacies to the "heirs of salvation;" the testator, who is owner and lord of all, did die; dying, he left such legacy, that is, an everlasting inheritance to those whom by character he plainly specified as his heirs. Every word in these two verses not only harmonizes with this view, but appears most plainly to express it. And it would seem impossible that any candid reader should hesitate a moment to embrace it, provided the two verses stood alone as isolated propositions. But their close connection with what precedes and follows compels the logical reader to attend to the course of argument; and, if this requires a different view from that just stated, to examine whether the words may not bear an exposition in harmony with it.

It is undeniable that every where in this epistle both before and after these verses, the word διαθήκη has the sense of covenant or dispensation, and not of will. The reader's very first impression therefore is, that, if possible, the same must be its sense here. And surely this is strengthened by the fact, that although it frequently occurs elsewhere in the New Testament, it is never found in the sense of will or testament; and moreover, that in the Septuagint it is employed in a vast number of places as the translation of the Hebrew *berith*, the usual word for covenant or dispensation, but which never has the meaning of will. Shall we then in those two verses give the Greek word a different meaning? We might reasonably hesitate to do so, even if, as the only alternative, we should be compelled to admit that we do not understand them. The invariable New Testament and general Septuagint usage of a word which is very often repeated, is not lightly to be abandoned for a classical one not elsewhere to be found in Scripture. The greater part of those commentators who defend the meaning of *will*, *testament*, confine it to these two verses, allowing that both the previous and subsequent contexts require the usual sense of *covenant*, *dispensation*. And if it were possible to give a satisfactory exposition of the whole portion on this theory, it would probably be best to adopt it. Thus the author will be supposed to have his mind turned from the former uniformly employed Hellenistic sense of the word to its classical meaning, because this meaning is exactly appropriate to the case of Jesus as the testator of his redeemed and heirs, to whom on the occasion of his death he bequeaths the heavenly inheritance. This may really be

ἐπεὶ μήποτε ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος.	testament *is* of force after men are dead; otherwise it is of no strength

---

the case, and the two verses may express the very thought which our English translation gives. But I do not think that the connection of the verses and the argument involved will allow us to abandon the other meaning. If we admit that of *testament*, we cannot exclude that of *covenant*, and shall be compelled to combine both, the former standing as an isolated statement, and the latter in logical connection with the argument. That the author might employ his words in these two senses, is certainly very possible on the ground just mentioned, although the supposition, so far from according with his general usage, is without any similar instance to sustain it. That he could have confounded in his mind the two meanings, and here unconsciously have employed the word in another sense than elsewhere, is not only incredible but palpably ridiculous. Such a surmise is unworthy of so learned and accurate and polished a writer, to say nothing of his divine authority, and would only prove the weakness and inadequacy of its author.

I have remarked that the logical connection appears to demand the meaning of covenant or dispensation. The general train of thought from ver. 15 to 18 inclusive will run thus: 'The atoning death of Jesus having taken place, he is therefore in the Christian covenant the mediator between God and man, and thus all sins are pardonable, and promise is given of everlasting happiness. For the establishment of a covenant requires the death of that which ratifies it, inasmuch as it is otherwise imperfect and invalid. Hence it is that the former covenant, the Mosaic, here compared with the Christian, was not established without blood.' Let the reader consider what is the bearing and logical connection of the first word in the 18th verse, "hence," *ὅθεν*. Certainly it is with what immediately precedes: 'A *διαθήκη* has no force while the *διαθέμενος* lives, and therefore (*hence* it is that,) the former, the Mosaic, was not ratified without blood.' Now adopt the other view of *διαθήκη*, and how stands the reasoning? 'A testament has no force while the testator lives, and therefore the Mosaic dispensation was not ratified without blood.' Is there such a semblance of an argument to be found in any other part of this epistle? Here we have two assertions wholly independent of each other, the latter being no sequence at all from the former, although represented as such. It might not be difficult to cull such flowers of logic out of our modern transcendental theology, but the clear-headed writer of this epistle cannot be suspected by a judicious reader to be guilty of any such silly trifling. To make out such an analogy, he should have spoken of the death of Moses as the ratification, whereas he immediately mentions that of bulls and goats. If it be said that the logical connection of *ὅθεν*, *hence*, is with verse 15, the next

at all while the testator liveth. 18 Whereupon neither the first *testa-*

18 Ὅθεν οὐδὲ ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγ-

---

two being parenthetical, then the train of thought will be as follows: 'The atonement of Jesus having been made by his death, and thus the new Christian covenant established, the former was therefore ratified by blood.' Kuinoel proposes this interpretation. "The connection is as follows: in order to sanction the new covenant, the death of Christ is necessary; wherefore the old, which was an adumbration of the new, was established by shedding the blood of victims." And Stuart acquiesces, in nearly the same words. "The course of thought, as it stands connected with ver. 15, seems to be this: 'the new covenant of redemption from sin was sanctioned by the death of Jesus;' consequently, or wherefore, the old covenant, which was to be a type of the new, was sanctioned by the blood of victims." And he adds: "In this way of interpretation, vs. 16, 17, are to be considered as a parenthesis, the matter of which merely amplifies and illustrates the declaration contained in ver. 15." This view does certainly suggest a thought of much interest and truth, namely, that the Mosaic sacrificial system was divinely instituted with direct reference to the future sacrifice of Christ. It was his death, regarded prospectively, which led to the establishment of the Mosaic covenant. But however important and true this is, the apostle's analogies in this epistle are always drawn out the other way, namely, from the old dispensation to the new, from the blood of the former covenant to the death of Christ; whereas this supposed logical connection would be the very reverse of the writer's invariable order. The connection of "hence," therefore, is with what immediately precedes it.

In view of these difficulties we may certainly adopt the sentiment of Tholuck, that "it will at least be thought justifiable in the expositor to attempt taking διαθήκη, vs. 16, 17, in the usual sense." I shall quote the remarks of this able commentator: "Two circumstances appear entirely opposed to the signification *covenant;* ὁ διαθέμενος must denote the victim, and ἐπὶ νεκροῖς be rendered *over, in the case of* slain *victims.* Both certainly present difficulties; still these are not greater than that which arises, on the other hand, from the interruption of the context. So far as a victim *ratifies* the covenant, we say, it *establishes* it. The masculine gender does indeed appear to be against such a view. But suppose the author to personify the victim, and to regard it as a mediator. Might he not do this the more readily, inasmuch as in the new covenant, it was a *man* who took the place of the victim. *The dead,* ὁ νεκρός, in Greek as in German does certainly denote, when used as a substantive, only human dead, corpses of men. See Blomfield, seven against Thebes, ver. 1015. But why should we not take the word as neuter, thus making it signify *carcasses* in general,

19 κεκαίνισται. Λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς κατὰ νόμον ὑπὸ Μωϋσέως παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τράγων μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου καὶ ὑσσώπου, αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν ἐῤῥάντισε, λέγων·
20 τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἧς ἐνε-

ment was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every 19 precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, This *is* the blood 20

---

whether of men or beasts? In the later Greek *τὸ νεκρόν* was used in the sense of *τὸ πτῶμα*, as, for example, *τὸ νεκρόν τοῦ φιλίστου*, Plutarch, Vita Dionis, cap. 35, *τὰ νεκρὰ τῶν θυγατέρων*, Narr. Amat. 3, 73." Ἐπὶ may then mean 'on the ground, condition of,' as in Phil. iii. 9, where Storr renders it "sub conditione."—*Φέρεσθαι* may be translated, *to introduce, bring forward*. The necessity referred to is that which results from common and long established usage.

On the whole, then, it appears to me that we cannot abandon this view of the passage. It is certainly true that it is God who makes or ratifies or establishes a covenant; and the very Greek word here twice rendered "*testament*" in our translation, we have in the form of a verb in viii. 10 rendered "*I will make*" in reference to God's *establishing* the Gospel covenant. But the same is eminently true of man's salvation. It is God alone who is "*the Saviour;*" and yet the ministry and baptism are said to *save*. See Rom. xi. 14, 1 Cor. ix. 22, Jude, 23, 1 Pet. iii. 21. On the same principle, the victim by whose death a covenant was ratified and established may be represented by the very term, which, in strict propriety of language, is only applicable to God himself.

18. The first or former evidently relates to the *διαθήκη*, just mentioned as also in ver. 1.

19–22. The author refers here to various ceremonies that were performed on various occasions under the law, and perhaps too at the consecration of the tabernacle and of Aaron and his sons. See Exod. xxiv. xxix. 1–21, xl., and other similar places, a particular detail of which is given by Stuart. Some of the circumstances here specified are not mentioned in the law. It contains no statement of the sprinkling of "the book," and therefore certain interpreters have attempted to connect this word grammatically with "the blood" before spoken of, and to govern it by the participle which is translated "he took." But this is quite unnecessary, and would require either a rejection of the copulative that follows the word, which would be altogether without authority, or to give it the unnatural meaning of *even*. Such sprinkling of the book of the law and the other circumstances alluded to are natural, and they are introduced as matters evidently well known. The writer may reasonably have presumed them to have taken place, or

of the testament which God hath
21 enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels
22 of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of
23 blood is no remission. *It was* there-

τείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός· καὶ τὴν 21 σκηνὴν δὲ καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας τῷ αἵματι ὁμοίως ἐῤῥάντισε. Καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα 22 καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις. Ἀνάγ- 23

---

his acquaintance with them may have been traditionary.—In ver. 22, σχεδόν qualifies πάντα: "Almost all things;" because some were purified by water, and some few by fire. See Levit. xvi. 26, 28, and Num. xxxi. 23, 24.

23. "Patterns:" The Greek is the plural of the same word which in viii. 5, is rendered "example." See the note there. It means representations, and is used to express the Jewish tabernacles with their appropriate appliances for sacred service. It was necessary by divine appointment that these should be ceremonially purified, and thus made fit for the uses for which they were designed, by such sacrifices and rites as had just been noted. In Levit. xvi., mention is often made of atoning for or purifying the holy place and the altar. See vs. 16, 18, 20, 23. In the first of these verses the reason given is especially worthy of note: "Because of the uncleanness of *the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins.*" This harmonizes with the fact, that in the last "the atonement" made for "the sanctuary, the tabernacle, and the altar," is immediately followed by "an atonement *for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation.*" It seems to intimate that every thing connected with sinful and impure humanity is considered as in some measure partaking of its infection.

"But the heavenly:" Not "things," which the Greek does not require, but *holy places*, ἅγια. This must be understood from the next verse, which shows also that "the heavenly" places and "heaven itself" are identical. We have the same usage in Eph. i. 3, 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12, where the adjective plural is employed for the noun, and is so translated in the Peshito Syriac, namely, "heaven." Our English translation has "heavenly *places*," except in the last instance, where without sufficient reason it substitutes "high." The "better sacrifices," θυσίαις, are certainly the one sacrifice of Christ, which is elsewhere invariably expressed in the singular. See ver. 26, x. 12, 14. Peile translates, "some better sacrifice," and remarks in a note, "such, agreeably to classical usage, is the exact force of the indefinite plural θυσίαις, Angl. *some sacrifice or other.*" But he gives no citations or references to sustain the statement. The plural may be here used in view of the multitude of Jewish sacrifices, and in order to intimate the infinite superiority to all of them of Christ's one offering. And thus

κη οὖν, τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι· αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια κρείττοσι θυσίαις 24 παρὰ ταύτας. Οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα

fore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is 24

Hugo de Sancto Caro: "With better sacrifices: that is, the sacrifice of Christ. But he employs the plural number, because Christ is signified by all those legal sacrifices which purified." Compare the use of "baptisms" in vi. 2. Such a use of the plural when an individual is intended may be found in classical writers. Thus Virgil has, *generos* externis ab oris, *qui* nostrum Nomen in astra *ferant*, although Æneas only is meant, vii. 270, 272. Also in xii. 658, *Quos generos* vocet. And in xi. 496, fremit *cervicibus* is used of *liber equus*. Instances of the same usage occur in Greek writers, from whom it is sufficient to cite one or two passages. In Homer we have τόξα and ὀχέων used for a single bow and chariot, Iliad, iii. 17, 29; and Anacreon expresses the back of one bull by νώτοις, Ode 35th, Barnes' Edition, Lond. 1734, p. 108, top.

The chief point of difficulty in this verse is, that heaven seems to be represented as needing purification by Christ's sacrifice. Doddridge remarks that "heaven would have been, as it were, polluted by the entrance of such sinners as went into it, had not the blood of Christ intervened." But this way of speaking is very loose and inaccurate. What "sinners went" (or rather could have gone,) "into heaven," without the intervention of the blood of Christ? The idea of pollution in such a connection presumes something which, in the very nature of things, is impossible. The simple solution of the difficulty is, that the verb "purify," which relates directly to the tabernacles, the *representations*, is applied indirectly, and by a figure of speech called zeugma,* to the *heavenly* realities, and conveys in each case the idea of *making accessible* or *available* to the necessary purpose. The Scriptures abound with instances of this figure, though from various causes they are often unobserved. Thus we have in Hosea ii. 18, "I will break the bow and the sword and the battle," where the idea of *breaking* is to be confined to "the bow and the sword," and the verb as applied to "battle" means *destroy*, *bring to an end*. So in Isa. lxii. 4, the word "marry" is applied figuratively to the country, expressing the idea of being *inhabited*, the connecting thought being that of numerous progeny, as if it had been said, thy country shall be in a married state; and in the next verse the same word denotes *habitation*, *possession*, *enjoyment*. In Luke i. 64, we have, "and his mouth was *opened* and his tongue;" where our translators have removed the seeming inapplicability of the verb by adding "loosed," which is not in the Greek. Col. ii. 20 affords a

* From ζεύγνυμι, to join, because the one verb is grammatically joined to two nouns.

not entered into the holy places made with hands, *which are* the	ἅγια εἰσῆλθεν ὁ Χριστός, ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν,

most striking illustration of this principle, where angels as well as men are said to be reconciled by Christ, while the meaning is, that both are thus brought together into one holy company, the proper reconciliation being intended only of men. Compare the important parallel place in Eph. i. 10; also iii. 15, and Heb. xii. 22. The figure is often employed in the Latin and Greek classics, and the best German writers avail themselves of it to a degree which our stricter English usage would hardly allow. Thus Schiller, in his eleventh letter on his Don Carlos, uses the verb *herunterblicken, to look down*, both in reference to a *lofty* ideal of virtue and to *a friend* intended to be benefitted by the exercise of it.* A striking instance is to be found of the combination of this figure with an idiomatic expression in Buerger's Poem on the Sparrow: Da wird nicht Hund und Hahn nach kraehn;† meaning, 'not a soul will care about it,' but literally rendered, 'there neither dog nor cock *will crow*.'—The meaning therefore of the clause in the epistle is simply this: that heaven has been made accessible by the sacrifice of Christ. By it all impediments to the free entrance of penitent sinners have been removed.

In order to illustrate still further what has just been said, I would request attention to our Saviour's words, "I go to *prepare* a place for you," John xiv. 2, and to the same expression in Heb. xi. 16, "God hath *prepared* for them a city." As heaven can need no preparation, this language must be intended to express *what was necessary* to be done in order to ensure reception into a state of future and heavenly happiness. And, most probably, the same thought is intended by the words in Dan. ix. 24, "to *anoint* the most holy." They are generally supposed to relate to the divine commission of Jesus as the Messiah; and in this meaning the word "anoint" is used in Isa. lxi. 1. Thus the Vulgate understands them, ut ungatur *sanctus* sanctorum, and the Syriac version explains them of the Messiah. But the phrase "most holy," though of very frequent occurrence in the Old Testament, is never used of a *person*. It relates to very holy *things*, and particularly to the most holy *place*. This is probably its meaning here, and the word *anoint* is figurative for consecrate, devote, prepare. Thus in Exod. xl. 9, 11: "Thou shalt take the *anointing* oil and *anoint* the tabernacle and all that is therein, and shalt *hallow* it, and it shall be *holy*. And thou shalt *anoint* the altar of the burnt-offering, and it shall be an altar most *holy*. And thou shalt *anoint* the laver and his foot, and *sanctify* it." To the same purpose Levit. viii. 11, and Num. vii. 1: He *anointed* the altar and all its vessels to *sanctify* them; Moses

* Saemmtliche Werke, vol. xi. p. 383, 12mo, 1828.

† Gedichte, p. 60.

νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ 25 θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ ἑαυτόν, ὥσπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν 26 αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ· (ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολ-	figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should 25 offer himself often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then 26

had set up the tabernacle, and *anointed* it, and *sanctified* it." The "man greatly beloved," therefore, had a prophetic view of the great truth, that the Messiah by his "one sacrifice of himself once for all," was to make accessible the holiest, even "heaven itself."

24. "Made with hands:" that is, "worldly" and imperfect, as before in ver. 11.—"Figures:" the word means *what correspond to.* It occurs but twice in the New Testament, here and in 1 Pet. iii. 21. In this latter place, it has the sense of our term *antitype;* here, on the contrary, it means *type*, that is, figure, emblem, representation.

25. "The holy place;" signifying the most holy, as the same plural word is employed before. See on viii. 2.—"Blood of others:" rather, 'blood not his own,' meaning, of course, that of the victims. "Two points of difference are here suggested between the Jewish offerings and that of Christ; the one that they were often repeated while his was made but once; the other that the high-priest presented the blood of goats and bullocks, but Jesus his own blood." Stuart.

26. "For then:" ἐπεί, since, on that supposition. The first part of this verse is by some editors enclosed in a parenthesis. This is not only unnecessary, but it weakens the impression which the clause is evidently intended to produce. The apostle most clearly presumes that if Christ's offering were frequently repeated, his sufferings must also be repeated. The idea of a sacrifice of Christ offered in the eucharist, or indeed of any repetition of the one sacrifice of Christ which was made on the cross, never seems to have occurred to him. He connects sufferings with offering as a necessary concomitant.

Certain Roman Catholic writers speak of the church as repeating Christ's acts. I quote from a late author, whose work has made a very powerful impression on some susceptible minds, but which is characterized chiefly by plausibility, acuteness, and a remarkable talent in presenting the most favourable view of his own system, and a pleasant caricature of that which he opposes. "The church, considered in one point of view, is the living figure of Christ, manifesting himself and working through all ages, whose atoning and redeeming acts it in consequence eternally repeats and uninterruptedly continues. The Redeemer is eternally living in his church." The author particularizes by reference to the eucharist, announcement of the word, baptism, and other institutions, and then proceeds thus:

must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but λάκις παθεῖν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου·) νῦν δὲ ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων

"If Christ, concealed under an earthly veil, unfolds to the end of time his whole course of actions begun on earth, he of necessity eternally offers himself to the Father as a victim for men."* If the meaning were simply this, that the church in her religious services recals to the mind of her members, and thereby makes a vivid impression of what Christ while on earth personally did, we might place all this in the same category with St. Paul's language to the Galatians, "before whose eyes Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you," iii. 1. And some of it may bear this meaning. But not all; and by this intermingling of the *figurative* which contains a truth with the *literal* which is unfounded, the incautious reader is adroitly beguiled. "The church is the living figure of Christ," and "he is eternally living" therein. But by what process of reasoning does it follow, that "in consequence it repeats and continues his atoning and redeeming acts?" As well might it be said, that it repeats his creative acts. Who gave this "living figure" the right or power so to do? On what authority does the *figurative* Christ do over again what the *real personal* Christ once did, and what our apostle declares him to have done once for all?

For the benefit of Protestants, to whom "it is a matter of much difficulty to form a clear conception of this dogma," the author most kindly adds the following in order to "explain" (!) to them "the Catholic view." "Christ on the cross has offered the sacrifice for our sins. But the church hath, at his *command*, (Luke xxii. 20,) *substituted* the Christ mysteriously present and visible only to the spiritual eye of faith, for the historical Christ now inaccessible to the corporeal senses. The former is *taken for* the latter, because the latter *is likewise* the former—both are *considered* as one and the same; and the eucharistic Saviour, *therefore* (!) as the victim also for the sins of the world."† This is the substance of the *explanation*. Its logical power will be evident by a slight attention to the italicised words. The text in St. Luke contains no such command as is here asserted. The writer's statements are, for the most part, a tissue of assumptions; and they can only appear plausible to one who is so dull as not to perceive, that he attempts to confound the *personal* Christ Jesus "who was born of the Virgin Mary and who suffered under Pontius Pilate," with the *figurative* Christ, the church, which is called his body in consequence of its intimate and living union with him its head. This same writer says also that "in the church on earth, the works wrought by Christ during his earthly life, for the redemption and sanctification of mankind

* Moehler's Symbolism, New York, 1844, p. 312. † Ibid. pp. 312, 313.

εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας	now once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin

are, under the guidance of his Spirit, *continued to the end of the world.*" And, after speaking of the church as perpetuating Christianity in the world, he states that "the visible church, from the point of view here taken, *is the Son of God himself everlastingly manifesting himself among men in a human form, perpetually renovated and eternally young, the permanent incarnation of the same,* as in Holy Writ, even the faithful are called 'the body of Christ.'"* Taken in its plain meaning, this latter passage implies an avowal of a species of pantheism.

The pretence of repeating the Redeemer's one and only offering in the sacrifice of the mass, is in most direct opposition to the doctrine of this epistle. Indeed the whole system of proper sacrifice, priest, and altar, apart from *Christ's own personal being and action,* is at variance with the teachings of the inspired author, and has no support in any part of the New Testament. If Christ is offered more than once, he must suffer more than once. "The apostle assumes it as a conceded point, that no sacrifice takes place without death. It is an axiom of the Spirit, that the effusion of blood is essential to expiation." Thus Calvin, with undeniable truth.† And most probably it is with a view to this, that the apostle immediately afterwards speaks of men's dying only "once" as analogous to Christ's having been but "once offered." There is only one death for men on earth, and there is only one offering by Christ, and that implies his death.

The following brief remarks of Cardinal Hugo are worthy of consideration, particularly by those who advocate a repetition of Christ's one sacrifice of himself. "It remains therefore that, once offered, he sufficed for the purgation even of those sins which had been committed from the beginning of the world. And here four things are to be noted. First, the sufficiency of the sacrifice; inasmuch as he says, *once,* Rom. vi., Christ, being risen from the dead, dieth no more. The second relates to the time, in the end of the world (or ages;) that is, in the end of the times. The third is the efficacy of Christ's passion or offering; for the putting away of sin. The fourth is the dignity of the sacrifice; by the sacrifice of himself, he being both sacrifice and priest, and such a sacrifice being worthy of being presented in the divine presence." It must be evident, that Cardinal Hugo here says nothing of the many offerings, or (which is equivalent.) the one repeated offering, which the church of Rome and others, who in this point sympathize with her, maintain to be presented to God in the holy eucharist in behalf of the living and the dead. But it is inconceiv-

* Moehler's Symbolism, New York, 1844, pp. 332, 333.

† Commentarii in Omnes Epistolas S. Pauli, &c., Amstel. 1668, fol. p. 560.

27 by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, | αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται. Καὶ καθ' ὅσον 27 ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἀπο-

---

able that any author whose church-system involved such a doctrine, could here have consistently kept it out of view.

"The end of the world:" Some critics regard the original phrase, *συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων*, as denoting the confines of the ages or dispensations, meaning the Jewish and the Christian. See Dr. Pye Smith on the Messiah, vol. ii. pp. 219, 220; also Schleusner on the word, and Peile's note. Job xxvi. 10 in the Septuagint has been appealed to in support of this sense of *συντέλεια*, but the reference is not decisive. It is better to retain our English version, "the end," which is an undoubted signification of the word. The phrase may either be translated "the end of the ages," meaning the last age or dispensation, that is, the Christian; or the plural may be used as the singular, of which we have examples in *οὐρανός* and *οὐρανοί*, *σάββατον* and *σάββατα*: thus the meaning will be, at the expiration of the Jewish age. The former view is, I think, to be preferred. Comp. *τέλη τῶν αἰώνων*, in 1 Cor. x. 11.—The words, "by the sacrifice of himself," may be connected with the clause "to put away sin," and thus they will express the means of removing it. But most probably and in accordance also with the Greek, their closer connection is with the verb "hath appeared;" and this appearance may be regarded as continued during the whole period of Christ's dispensation. The meaning will then be as follows: 'But now once, in the last of the dispensations, in order to put away sin he hath appeared (or been made manifest, *πεφανέρωται*,) partly on earth, but chiefly in heaven, by or along with the offering of himself.' The manifestation of Christ is principally in that everlasting life of his in which he ever maketh intercession for us. This view of the verse is confirmed by the verb, "to appear," *ἐμφανισθῆναι*, in the 24th verse. That the word employed in the former verse is elsewhere used of Christ's appearance on coming on earth, as Kuinoel says (See 1 Pet. i. 20, 1 John iii. 5, 8,) is no valid objection to this more comprehensive view. The meaning here is to be settled by the context.

27, 28. The analogy requires no illustration. To undergo death once is the unavoidable lot of mortals, and once did Christ voluntarily offer himself to take away sins. The subsequent "judgment" appears to be introduced rather for a practical effect, than as having any direct bearing on the general train of thought; and it arises naturally from its connection with death. Christ's second appearance, it is said, shall be "without sin." If this translation were admitted, the apostle can hardly be supposed merely to express the thought, that he will be sinless. This would be frigid, particularly as he was so at his first coming and during

28 θανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστός, ἅπαξ προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας, ἐκ δευτέρου χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας ὀφθήσεται τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις εἰς σωτηρίαν.

X. Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ

but after this the judgment, so 28 Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation.

For the law, having a shadow of X. good things to come *and* not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they

---

his earthly sojourn. The idea would probably be, that his second coming will be disconnected from sin and without any reference to it; it will be for the salvation of those who in faith and patience are waiting for him. But the original word bears the sense of sin-offering. See Schleusner's Thesaurus Vet. Test. under ἁμαρτία. And this agrees better with the context and general sentiment of the epistle. At his first coming he offered himself once for all; his second will be without any repetition of his offering, as the one before made was in all respects sufficient and satisfactory.

In the account of the services of the day of expiation, the law directs that, after the high-priest has performed all the ceremonies in the most holy place, "he shall come forth, and offer his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people, and make an atonement for himself and for the people." Levit. xvi. 24. This seems to imply that what had before been done in the most holy place was imperfect, and that atonement both for the high-priest and for the people was still necessary. Perhaps the author of the epistle may have this fact in view, and intend to suggest the contrast between the inadequacy of the Jewish atonement made in the most holy place, and the sufficiency of Christ's presentation of his offering in heaven. The high-priest comes from the holiest, and offers an atoning sacrifice; Christ comes from heaven, but makes no further atonement. That he had already done most effectively. He comes now to save the pardoned. And it is not unlikely, that in another point a comparison implying similarity may be intended. Doubtless the religious Hebrew waited piously without the holy places for the appearance of the high-priest, as the people waited for the priest Zechariah, Luke i. 21. And thus the true Christian will devoutly wait for the second appearance of his great high-priest and intercessor from the most holy place in heaven.

x. 1. "Shadow" is in contradistinction to "image." The words are figures, taken either from painting or sculpture. Our translators appear to have had in view the latter case. According to the former, the reference will be to the artist's rough sketch and to the completed portrait. In neither have we the reality itself, the living man. This has suggested the objection that thus the author makes the law to be a figure of a figure, the

offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.
2 For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins.
3 But in those *sacrifices there is* a remembrance again *made* of sins every
4 year. For *it is* not possible that

διηνεκές, οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι· ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο 2 *προσφερόμεναι, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας, ἅπαξ κεκαθαρμένους; Ἀλλ'* 3 *ἐν αὐταῖς ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν· ἀδύνατον γὰρ αἷμα ταύρων* 4

---

shadow of a statue or the outlines of a picture. But this presumes the shadow, *σκία*, to be introduced as the representation of the image, *εἰκών*, which the author does not say. What he does say is simply this, that, although the law was an adumbration of future good things, it was but an imperfect adumbration. Still, it cannot be denied that the future good things of which it is said to have been this imperfect adumbration, are in part those which have actually been already realized. The true solution of any difficulty in this connection is this, that the good things promised in the former dispensation are those that appertain to Messiah and his kingdom, and that they begin here on earth and continue eternally in heaven. This is a most important truth, and may serve to explain much which otherwise seems obscure. Hence it is said that the believer "hath everlasting life" already, that he is already "glorified." John iii. 36, Rom. viii. 30. Hence it is that St. Paul, quoting language from Isaiah which relates in its full and ultimate signification to the bliss of heaven, applies it to divinely revealed knowledge communicated to him and his coadjutors. Isa. lxiv. 4, 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10. And hence in Col. ii. 17, the "shadow" is contrasted with "the body," the reality, the possession and enjoyment of which is now entered upon.—"Those:" better, *the same* "sacrifices," meaning in kind and nature. "Year by year:" referring, as in ver. 3 also, to the day of atonement before mentioned. "Continually:" during the whole dispensation. See on vii. 3. "Perfect:" as explained on vii. 11. The verse is introduced with "for," which is illative of what has just been said. The Jewish dispensation was merely prefigurative, and its services and offerings were constantly repeated, and *therefore* it was incompetent to bring its worshippers into a condition of perfection. The tense which is here used may be regarded as the historical present.

2. Our translators have very properly read *οὐκ* after *ἐπεί*, which has very strong external authority. "Conscience" is used in the sense of consciousness, meaning apprehension of wrath and punishment.

4. Whitby has an important note on ver. 14, to show why the legal sacrifices could not take away sin. The inadequacy of such sacrifices to sustain God's honour and to vindicate his moral government, is the principal reason.

5 καὶ τράγων ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας. Διὸ εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον λέγει· θυ-	the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore, 5

5–7. "Wherefore:" on account of this impossibility. The quotation which immediately follows is from Ps. xl. 6–8. It agrees with the Septuagint, (xxxix.) except in the substitution of the last word of ver. 6, εὐδόκησας, for another of similar meaning, ᾔτησας, or as some copies read ἐζήτησας, then didst *ask* or *seek*. In the Hebrew we have, as in our English translation, "mine ears hast thou opened," for which the Greek is, "a body hast thou prepared me." Critics have resorted to various methods of accounting for this rendering of the Septuagint. Some have conjectured that the Hebrew text used in preparing this translation varied somewhat from our present copies, and indeed it would only require a slight alteration to allow such a version. If, instead of the present reading אזנים, the copy had read אז גוף or אז גוה, its translation might have been elicited from these words. Others, supposing the Psalmist to allude to the law in Exod. xxi. 6, Deut. xv. 17, which required the servant who bound himself to become his master's for life, to have his ear pierced with an awl, consider the word σῶμα as equivalent to permanent servant or slave, as it was sometimes used by the Greeks, and regard the clause as denoting the speaker's entire devotion of himself to God as his obedient servant. Thus the general idea would be the same as that of our correct translation, "mine ears hast thou opened," that is, 'thou hast made me docile and submissive,' and this would be expressed in the Septuagint by a reference to the law. But the Hebrew word here used is not the same as that of the command referred to. It means *to dig out*, and thus to remove any obstruction which might impede a ready perception of and obedience to precept; whereas the other is, to *bore through*. And further the law limited the operation to one ear, but the Psalmist speaks of both. If therefore the Greek translators were governed by this view of the meaning, they undoubtedly mistook it. But this can hardly have been their view, for the Greek does not express it. Even assuming this sense of *body*, the meaning would rather be, 'thou hast prepared *for me* a devoted and permanent servant,' not 'thou hast prepared *me to become*,' or, '*to be* such a servant.' Others again have conjectured that the original Greek word was ὠτία, *ears*, and that previously to the writing of the epistle, σῶμα, *body*, had accidentally been substituted for it. Thus what was at first in the Septuagint, 'ears hast thou prepared to me,' that is, 'mine ears hast thou prepared,' became altered into "a body hast thou prepared for me."

Whatever may have given rise to this reading in the Septuagint, the author of the epistle quotes the Greek text as he finds it. But it by no means follows that he thereby stamps this translation of the clause with the seal of his authority. The bearing of the quotation on his argument

when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou

σίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας, σῶμα

---

or statement does not depend upon this clause, but upon the whole passage. It is true he does afterwards, ver. 10, speak of the offering of Christ's *body*, adopting the word here employed. But this was perfectly natural. It suited his purpose exceedingly well, although most certainly it was not essential to it. The New Testament contains many such cases of adherence to the letter of the Septuagint, either to express the writer's own thought, or where the force of the quotation lies in its *general* statement and not in every *particular*. Of the former class we have an instance in Eph. iv. 26,* and of the latter in this passage and in viii. 9.

But the applicability of the quotation is the most important point. Does the apostle accommodate? or does he put his own representation of Messiah's mind and will in the Psalmist's language? or does the Psalmist himself speak in the person of the Messiah, and the apostle apply his language according to the meaning intended by the Spirit who prompted the Psalm? The composition itself and the connection and purport of the quotation must be carefully considered, in order to enable us to form a right judgment in the case.

The views already expressed on the subject of accommodation,† will of course prepare the reader to expect that, in the present instance, its application cannot be advocated. Accommodation is not necessary, and therefore not admissible. Which of the other alternatives should be adopted is not positively certain. The whole Psalm may be explained without any violence to the meaning of the words, or to the unity of its general contents, or to the analogy of Scripture, solely in reference to David, or some Hebrew of proper thought and feeling, whose religious and spiritual character had raised him above a merely external system of rites and ceremonies to the spiritual truth and fulness which they adumbrated. And that there were such under the Mosaic system is certain from many intimations in the Old Testament, of which it may be sufficient to refer to the 50th and 119th Psalms; which are nothing more than a development of the words of Hosea, "I desired mercy and not sacrifice,"‡ or of Jeremiah, "I spake not unto your fathers concerning burnt-offering or sacrifices, but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice;"§ a sentiment which Samuel had long before endeavoured to impress on the mind of Saul in the words, "to obey is better than sacrifice."‖ The Psalm therefore may describe either David or some other pious Hebrew in deep distress, waiting on God in faith and patience and thank-

* See the remarks on Quotations, above, p. 28.
† Ib. p. 22, 23.
‡ vi. 6.
§ vii. 22, 23.
‖ 1 Sam. xv. 22.

6 δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι· ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ | wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt-offerings 6

---

ing him for deliverance. Under the influence of his grateful feelings, he refers to God's multiplied benefits which are beyond human computation. As a suitable return all external services of sacrifice and offering are incompetent; and they are not desired by the spiritual author of all good things. Therefore docility, attention to the divine will, submission and perfect obedience, holy fruits of a heavenly influence, are freely offered as acceptable and "reasonable services." Impressed by this great truth, the speaker avows his determination. 'I come! I offer myself, O God, "a living sacrifice" unto thee. My duty is prescribed to me in thy book, and my heart appreciates the excellence of its law. In accordance therewith have I acted without fear or hesitation. I have proclaimed internal religion, and announced thy truthfulness.' He then prays for a continuance of divine mercy; describes the distressed condition which bows him down; and concludes by a prayer of humility and faith.

I can see nothing in the Psalm inconsistent with the view just stated. In it "praise, trust, righteousness," obedience to God's will, are particularly commended, while "sacrifice and offering" are represented as inferior. I cannot therefore acquiesce in the remark of Tholuck, that "what David here says goes far beyond the Old Testament degree of advancement," unless with such limitations as the places before referred to compel us to admit. The speaker may be beyond the general "degree of advancement;" but he is not beyond that of many individual cases. Objections to the exegetical outline just given are readily answered. The words, "I come," are certainly explicable *of intention, of determination boldly and prominently avowed.* It cannot be denied that the original word rendered "of me," especially in connection with *writing*, may be translated *to me*, and thus the clause may express the thought just given: 'my duty is prescribed to me.' Although it is not the common meaning of the Hebrew preposition, yet we find it used in this sense in 1 Kings xi. 11, "which I have commanded thee," literally, '*to* thee,' and 2 Kings xxii. 13, "our fathers have not hearkened to do according unto all that which is written *concerning* us," better, 'which has been prescribed *to* us,' as the subject is the divine law. Stuart indeed demurs about admitting this meaning. He says that the Hebrew "may be rendered with about equal significancy, *which was written in respect to us* or *concerning us*, that is, for our sake or *to regulate our duties*." What do these last words mean, but *to prescribe to us a law?* His explanation then is the very meaning of which he just before says, "I must still doubt!" The same preposition is thus used also in Gen. ii. 16, and Ezra i. 2, though not with the verb *to write.* The Koran too employs it in this sense, and, what is particularly

and *sacrifices* for sin thou hast had no pleasure: then said I, Lo, I come

περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας. Τότε

worthy of notice, in connection with this verb: "War (or slaughter) is prescribed (commanded) *to* you:"—"if war be written (prescribed, commanded) *to* you."*

On the supposition now that the Psalm relates wholly to David or some other pious Hebrew, the apostle may here quote it to express his own train of thought. His meaning may be as follows: 'On account of the inadequacy of external offerings, the Messiah, on his entrance into the world, expresses what the Old Testament in the 40th Psalm and elsewhere declares, namely, that such sacrifices and offerings as pertained to the old dispensation were not the services particularly pleasing to God, which on the contrary are submission and obedience. And therefore he avows his determination to do God's will in accordance with what had been prescribed to him.' The will of God, which in this view the Messiah will declare his readiness to suffer and to do, implies of course his devotion to death as a sacrifice for sin; and thus the idea in the quotation corresponds with the prominent one of the epistle, namely, the inadequacy of Jewish sacrifices and the necessity of some better offering: and this not merely to satisfy justice and honour the divine law, but also to secure ability to enable the believer to lead a life of holy moral obedience.

The volume referred to is, most probably, the Pentateuch. David could hardly have any other in view. Scarcely any other portion of the Bible had in his time been made public, and none to which such allusion could possibly be made. The word rendered volume is properly the *head* or *top* part of the rod on which the book, that is, the manuscript, was rolled, and is used by a figure for the roll itself. The Hebrew is *roll* and this is properly expressed in one of the old Greek versions, that of Aquila. In Ezek. iii. 1, "eat this *roll*," we have in the Septuagint the Greek word which is here used, and so in the next verse.

Still it must be granted that, on this theory of the interpretation and application of the Psalm, the author's fundamental and leading idea is only implied, not directly asserted in the quotation. Let us then consider whether the Psalm is not susceptible of such a direct application as the use made of the quotation may seem to require.

In forming a judgment respecting the application of certain Psalms to the Messiah, two errours are to be avoided. It is not to be assumed that a Psalm is prophetic of the Messiah because the language would suit him, nor denied to be so because it would suit others. The last remark may bear upon the 40th Psalm. This may be applicable to David or some pious Hebrew in distress; but it would be wholly unwarrantable to infer

* Sura II. ver. 216, 247, Marracci's Edition, fol. Patav. 1698, pp. 74, 90.

εἶπον· ἰδοὺ ἥκω (ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ) τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ	(in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O

---

that therefore it could not have been intended of Christ. He was the most pious of all Hebrews and the most distressed; and therefore language suited to the character and condition of the former may be most appropriate to the latter. In this Psalm, therefore, the Messiah may express submission, patience, faith in trial, and joy also in deliverance. In the latter part he may return to the feeling and state of mind which elicited the former. The theory of Venema, Seiler, Dathe and others, that in the former and latter parts David is the speaker, and that Messiah is introduced in the intermediate portion, cannot be sustained. To omit other reasons, it is not credible that the words in ver. 9, "I have not *withheld* my lips," and "*withhold* not thou thy mercies from me," in ver. 11, in both of which the Hebrew verb is the same, and ought to be so translated, can be intended of different persons. If the Psalm is Messianic, the Messiah may be the speaker throughout. The "iniquities" which, according to our English translation, he laments, are most probably *afflictions*. This meaning best agrees with the context, and that the Hebrew word is so used is undeniable, and is indeed affirmed by Kimchi and the best Hebrew commentators. One instance of this meaning occurs in 2 Sam. xvi. 12.* Indeed, if it were certain that the 40th Psalm had no reference to the Messiah, this would be the best translation of the word. The peculiar applicability of the expression, "lo, I come," to the Messiah is self-evident; and although the next clause does bear the exposition above given, 'prescribed *to* me,' yet the more usual sense of the preposition is that which the Septuagint gives and which the apostle has followed, "of" or "concerning." In the Pentateuch, which, as I have remarked, is doubtless the book referred to, "Moses spake of" Christ, as he himself declares.† His "delight to do God's will" is illustrated by the fact that he "came down from heaven" for that very purpose.‡ His public proclamation of religion was exemplified in the whole course of his ministry. The Psalmist therefore may personate the Messiah, and the poem contains nothing which is inconsistent with the theory that it is entirely Messianic.

If now this theory be admitted, the conclusion arrived at will be this, that the apostle's application and interpretation have determined the sense, of which antecedently we might not have been fully certain. But, even if the Psalm were originally intended of David or of some other pious Hebrew, still it may also have been intended ultimately of Christ. The chief objection to such a twofold application will be, that, in this case, one word at least of the original Hebrew must comprehend two meanings, namely, *to* and *concerning* me.—On the whole, therefore, the result most

* See Jewish Rabbies, p. 125, note ¶. † John v. 46. ‡ John vi. 38.

8 God. Above, when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt-offerings and *offering* for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure *therein;* 9 which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first,

θεός, τὸ θέλημά σου. Ἀνώτερον λέγων· 8 ὅτι θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν καὶ ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ἠθέλησας οὐδὲ εὐδόκησας· (αἵτινες κατὰ τὸν νόμον προσφέρονται·) τότε εἴρηκεν· 9 ἰδού, ἥκω τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου. ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον

---

in accordance with analogy seems to be this: to consider David as speaking of himself and the apostle as introducing the Messiah expressing his determinations and feelings in the royal language; or else, to regard the whole Psalm as such an exposition by the Messiah himself. On this last theory, the contrast between the Jewish sacrifices and that of Christ will be both between the inability of the former to afford sufficient satisfaction to God's moral government, and the perfection in this respect of the latter, and also to the security which this affords of divine assistance to live a holy life, of which the others could afford no pledge or promise. Compare Rom. viii. 4, where the result of the atonement of Christ, the very thing which the preceding verse had declared that "the law could not do," is said to be this, "that the righteousness of the law," that is, as the context shows, moral obedience, "might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."

8. "When he saith:" or rather, 'he saith.' The original is in the participial form, which is here employed, as in Hebrew, to express the present tense.

9, 10. "The first:" that is, the external sacrifices and offerings of the law. "The second:" that is, his own all-sufficient sacrifice, bringing reconciliation to God, and procuring abundant "grace to help our infirmities." To do what both could and would produce this result was the will of God; and therefore in accordance with this will, and by the one offering of Christ, we are sanctified, that is, atoned for and placed in a relation through which we may be abundantly supplied with divine aid. Compare note on ii. 11.

11, 12. Several expressions in these verses are antithetic. "Every priest" and "this one;" "standeth" and "sat down;" "the same sacrifices" and "one sacrifice;" "daily, often," and "forever." The intention of the author is self-evident.—"This man:" better, 'this one,' as the word *man* is not in the text, and the efficacy of the offering must not be limited to the *human* nature merely. The word, whether the true reading be ἀυτος or ὀυτος is antithetic to "every priest."—Critics differ as to the best punctuation of this verse. Many editors connect "forever" with "sat down." This accords with our common English editions, and is preferred by Stuart to another punctuation which connects it with "sacrifice." Tholuck, with

10 στήσῃ. Ἐν ᾧ θελήματι ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμὲν διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος 11 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ. Καὶ πᾶς μὲν ἱερεὺς ἕστηκε καθ' ἡμέραν λειτουργῶν καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πολλάκις προσφέρων θυσίας, αἵτινες οὐδέποτε δύνανται πε- 12 ριελεῖν ἁμαρτίας· οὗτος δέ, μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσίαν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, 13 τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως τεθῶσιν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν 14 αὐτοῦ. Μιᾷ γὰρ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους. 15 Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ 16 ἅγιον· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ προειρηκέναι· αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διαθήσομαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, λέγει κύριος· διδοὺς νόμους μου ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν διανοιῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω 17 αὐτούς,—καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ

that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified, 10 through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all*. And 11 every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But this man, after 12 he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting 13 till his enemies be made his footstool: For by one offering he hath 14 perfected for ever them that are sanctified. *Whereof* the Holy 15 Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This 16 *is* the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will

---

better reason, I think, advocates the latter; because *forever*, *continually*, *through the whole dispensation*, in one word, *so long as the mediatorial kingdom of Christ shall last*, which is intended by the original phrase εἰς τὸ διηνεκές,* "refers to the validity of the sacrifice, and also because it appears to stand in contrast to *often*." Thus the apostle will mean that Christ, having offered his own infinitely valuable sacrifice, the efficacy of which is to last through all time, in contradistinction to the continually repeated sacrifices of the Jews, which were imperfect and temporary even in the influence which they had, sat down in rest and honour at God's right hand. The phrase in ver. 14, "perfected forever" is in favour of this connection. The meaning of "perfected" has been before explained.

15. "Whereof," introduced by our translators, is implied in the text. The accurate rendering would be: 'And moreover the Holy Spirit also attests (this) to us. The particles δὲ and καὶ, when thus associated, generally intimate some additional shade of meaning, and therefore may properly be translated by *and moreover*.

16, 17. The quotation is the same as that before in viii. 10, with a few verbal alterations of little or no importance. De minimis non curat τὸ πνεῦμα.† Stuart regards the clause, "saith the Lord," as the introduc-

* See note on vii. 3, pp. 90, 91.

† After writing this, I saw that Prof. Stuart had said the same thing in reference to the same fact: "Non refert verbum, sed res ipsa.—*De minimis non curat lex*, say civilians in construing human laws; and the maxim applies as well to the manner of diction in the Scriptures as in any other book." The candid reader will ascribe the coincidence to the natural influence of truth on different minds.

17 I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.
18 Now where remission of these *is*, *there is* no more offering for sin.

τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι. 18 Ὅπου δὲ ἄφεσις τούτων, οὐκέτι προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας.

---

tion to the latter part of the sentence; to speak technically, as the *apodosis*, the former being what the rhetoricians would call the *protasis*. But the circumstance, that these words are a part of the quotation and of the prophetic passage, is against this view. See Jer. xxxi. 33. There is probably an ellipsis of some brief and simple expression introductory to the remark in the next verse; something equivalent to *he adds*, or *it follows*.

18. This verse expresses in few words the most important conclusion, which is sanctioned by the preceding statements and reasoning: 'When perfect forgiveness is attained, any other sacrifice than that which has secured it cannot exist.' The author and the Romanist are here directly at issue.

SECTION V.

Chap. X. 19–39.

THE OBLIGATION AND NECESSITY OF STEADFAST ADHERENCE TO THE GOSPEL INFERRED AND URGED.

19 Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the
20 blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say,
21 his flesh; and *having* a high-priest
22 over the house of God; let us draw

19 Ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παῤῥησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι 20 Ἰησοῦ, ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν, διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, 21 καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ 22 θεοῦ, προσερχώμεθα μετὰ ἀληθινῆς

The argumentative part of the epistle, so far as regards the leading topics, may now be considered as finished. Such an author, of course, must write logically, if he write at all. But the leading points are now disposed of, and what remains is chiefly inferential and practical.

19–25. "The holiest;" that is, heaven, as before explained. The "boldness" arises from the perfection of Christ's one offering, as already stated.—The "way" is said to be "*new*," because not before clearly made known and pointed out; and "*living*," because *continuing* and *permanent*. This is the invariable idea of living when used figuratively, though it sometimes may combine also another thought; namely, that of communicating

καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως, ἐῤῥαντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι 23 *καθαρῷ, κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῆ, (πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος,)* 24 *καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων,* 25 *μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τισίν, ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες, καὶ τοσούτῳ μᾶλ-*

near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. 23 Let us hold fast the profession of *our* faith without wavering; for he *is* faithful that promised; 24 and let us consider one another, to provoke unto love and to good works: 25 not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some *is;* but exhorting

---

life. See John iv. 10, 14, vi. 51.—"Through the veil, that is to say, his flesh:" The word *flesh* may be connected with *the way*, and the meaning be, 'through the way which his flesh hath established,' that is, his atonement, as the phrase "my *flesh* which I will give for the life of the world" is used in John vi. 51. Or, the veil may be identical with his *flesh*, his *body* or rather *human nature*, as the word *flesh*, is used in John i. 14. Thus the thought will be, that the human nature of Christ, and the veil which separated the holy from the most holy place, are in some respects analogous. Yet we must be cautious not to carry out the analogy too far. As the high-priest entered into the most holy place *through* the veil, so, only *through* or *by means of* Christ's atonement can we enter into heaven. This is the principal point. It may also be implied, that, as the veil concealed the mysterious symbols from ordinary gaze even of the priests, while yet it was the medium through which alone they could be contemplated; so the human nature of the Redeemer, while it prevented sinful man from looking directly at the infinitely glorious God, still gave him access by means of the all-sufficient atonement.—"House of God." See iii. 2, 5, 6.—"Full assurance of faith:" that is, such full conviction of the understanding and satisfaction of the mind as result from a real and living faith.—"Sprinkled" is a word taken from legal usage, meaning of course *cleansed;* and the next words show the cleansing to be internal.—'Washed as respects the body:' this may refer to baptism; or it may be figurative, and the whole verse express complete purification of the entire man: Comp. 1 Thess. v. 23. Some have chosen to connect this clause with what follows thus: 'washed &c., let us hold fast.' But it is much more natural to join it to the preceding clause, 'sprinkled,' &c.—The "assembling" of ver. 25, is, no doubt, that for Christian worship, which some lukewarm disciples had neglected.—"The day:" This expression is limited by some commentators to the period of the destruction of Jerusalem, the approach of which every true disciple might readily discern from evident signs. Others refer it to the great day of Christ's future coming and of men's

one another: and so much the more
26 as ye see the day approaching. For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice
27 for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the
28 adversaries. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two
29 or three witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?

λον, ὅσῳ βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν. Ἑκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων 26 *ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία· φοβερὰ δέ τις ἐκδοχὴ* 27 *κρίσεως, καὶ πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους. Ἀθετήσας* 28 *τις νόμον Μωϋσέως χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν ἀποθνήσκει· πόσῳ, δοκεῖτε, χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται* 29 *τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος, ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, καὶ*

---

final account. And others again explain it of the time of each individual's death, which, in a practical view, is to him equivalent to that great day. I see no sufficient reason why all these views may not be combined. And in 1 Cor. iii. 13, "the day" means most probably, any time of particular trial which may be a test of character and conduct, but most especially the great day of future judgment. Such a sense is not double or treble or multifold, but one, although the particulars intended may be several. The phrases, "the day" and "the day of the Lord," are used in reference to any occasions of remarkable divine interference, especially of a punitive kind; and sometimes when there is no allusion at all to any coming of Christ. The reader may satisfy himself by examining the places to which a concordance will refer him.

26–31. The general train of thought in these verses is the same as that in vi. 4–6. The punishment that must follow a state of apostasy after having received a knowledge of the truth is presented to the Hebrew Christians as a warning.—"Wilfully:" The context fully justifies this expression, although the original word does not necessarily denote more than *willingly*. The apostate who turns away from the only acceptable sacrifice, has of course none other to depend on, and must experience that divine indignation which is the natural consequence of sin unatoned for. The contemner of the law did not escape merited punishment; much less shall the apostate from the Gospel.—Ἐπί, on (the testimony of.)—"Two or three:" meaning *sufficient*.—"Trodden under foot" expresses the highest degree of contempt and hostility. This and other phrases in this connection are fully illustrated by most suitable quotations by Peirce in loc.—"The blood of the covenant:" that is, Christ's which ratifies it.—"Common:" of no more efficacy than

τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας;
30 Οἴδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα· ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει κύριος· καὶ πάλιν· κύριος κρινεῖ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.
31 Φοβερὸν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας θεοῦ ζῶντος.
32 Ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε δὲ τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες πολλὴν
33 ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων, τοῦτο μὲν ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσι θεατριζόμενοι, τοῦτο δὲ κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτως

For we know him that hath said, 30 Vengeance *belongeth* unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people. *It is* a fearful thing to fall 31 into the hands of the living God.

But call to remembrance the 32 former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions; partly, 33 whilst ye were made a gazingstock, both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, whilst ye became companions of them that were so

---

that of any other individual or sacrifice.—"Was sanctified:" atoned for, as in ii. 11, where see note.—"Spirit of grace:" the Holy Spirit who communicates divine favour.—"We know," &c. It is as if he had said, 'God hath threatened vengeance on such despisers of his grace.' See Deut. xxxii. 35.—The clause, "the Lord shall judge his people," cannot properly be explained of inflicting punishment, although this is the thought that pervades the immediate context, and the word *judge*, *κρίνω*, is often used for *condemn*, *κατακρίνω*. See, among other instances, John iii. 17, 18. The connection in which the words stand in Deuteronomy, ver. 36, is at variance with such a meaning. "The Lord shall judge his people and repent himself for his servants:" The two clauses are evidently parallel, and both imply favour and kindness, and this accords with the divine disposition and procedure towards his own. Peirce endeavours, but unsuccessfully, to prove the contrary. The word *judge* expresses also the idea of equitable, kind and merciful rule and protection. Hence it is said of the Messiah, "he shall judge the poor," Ps. lxxii. 4, Isa. xi. 4, that is, protect their interests, and defend them from oppression and wrong; hence the command, "judge the fatherless," Isa. i. 17, that is, espouse their cause; and hence also the phraseology, "God the judge of all," Heb. xii. 23, where the context requires the idea of a paternal and felicitous rule, the uniform operation of such a law as naturally brings along with it the most perfect and happy liberty. In the midst of serious and awful warning, with what beautiful tenderness does the author throw in for the true Christian's comfort, this little clause, "The Lord will judge his people!" He cannot neglect them. He will espouse and defend their cause. It is indeed his own.

32–35. The writer, with his characteristic Christian amiability of disposition, cannot say what might seem to be harsh, without such a qualification as the character and conduct of the persons addressed may at any time have merited. He therefore reminds these Hebrews who were in

34 used. For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.
35 Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath great recompense
36 of reward. For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive
37 the promise. For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come,

ἀναστρεφομένων γενηθέντες· καὶ γὰρ 34 *τοῖς δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε, καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὕπαρξιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ μένουσαν.* Μὴ *ἀποβάλητε οὖν τὴν* 35 *παῤῥησίαν ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἔχει μισθαποδοσίαν μεγάλην.* Ὑ*πομονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε* 36 *χρείαν, ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ποιήσαντες κομίσησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν.* Ἔτι 37 *γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει*

---

danger of backsliding, of what had been their former spiritual condition, not only with the view of consoling, but also of animating them to steadfastness of faith and to renewed efforts.

"Enlightened:" See note on vi. 4.—*Τοῦτο μὲν—τοῦτο δὲ* ' "as to this—as to that, the same as partly—partly." Robinson in *οὗτος*, 8.—"My bonds:" This passage cannot be urged in proof of St. Paul's being the author of this epistle, although in 2 Tim. i. 16, we have the similar phrase, "my chain;" for in place of *δεσμοῖς μου*, *my bonds*, the common Greek reading, which also is preferred by many critics, there is weighty authority for substituting *δεσμίοις*, *the prisoners*, which some of the best late editors have introduced, and which corresponds with the same word in xiii. 3. The reader will find it above, as in Hahn.—"Knowing in yourselves that ye have:" The translation of the original, according to the usual reading, would rather be, 'knowing that you have in yourselves.' But most probably the preposition is not genuine, and the true translation is, 'that ye have to (or for) yourselves.' This is a pleonastic mode of expression not at all uncommon. Comp. John v. 26, 42, vi. 53, 61, xi. 38.

36–39. "The promise:" that is, its accomplishment.—"He that cometh," &c. Comp. on ver. 25.—*Μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον* is equivalent to *very short indeed.* It occurs in Isa. xxvi. 20, to which most likely there is an allusion. The expression here and in the next verse is taken from Hab. ii. 3, 4, though the arrangement of the language is altered. The prophet assures those whom he addresses, that the prediction will certainly be accomplished and that soon; and, moreover, that while the proud, self-confident wants sincerity and uprightness, the just, the truly religious man will live by steady faith and confidence in God. This same text is quoted in Rom. i. 17, and Gal. iii. 11. The Septuagint has *my*, *μοῦ*, after faith, meaning *faith in me*, according to the usual New Testament phraseology, *πίστις* Ἰ*ησοῦ χριστοῦ*, literally, 'faith *of*' for 'faith *in* Jesus Christ.' Thus we have, "by his knowledge," for, 'by our knowledge of him,' in Isa. liii. 11; and in the Collect for Peace in our morning service, "in knowl-

38 καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ. Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται· καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ. 39 Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς.

and will not tarry. Now the just 38 shall live by faith; but if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not 39 of them who draw back unto perdition, but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.

---

edge of whom standeth our eternal life;" which means that this life consists in our right knowledge of God. Comp. John xvii. 3. As the prophet is speaking of the truly religious man's steady faith in God under apprehended calamity, the Apostle's application of his words in view of the approaching trial is exceedingly apposite.—"*Any man* draw back:" Our translators understand τὶς, which is certainly an allowable ellipsis. Perhaps also they may have thought that the next verse favoured the introduction of such an expression, and that if "draw back," ὑποστείληται, were predicated of "the just," ὁ δίκαιος, it should be introduced by 'but if,' ἐὰν δέ, and not καὶ ἄν.. I cannot but think, however, that the most natural translation of the whole is to this effect: 'the just shall live by faith, and if he draw back,' &c. Diodati has so translated it, except that for *and* he has *but*: "ma se egli si sottræ." The older English versions agree. Thus Wiclif has: "my just man lyveth of feith, that if he with drawith hym silf;" Tyndale and Cranmer: "the just shall live by faith. And if he with drawe him selfe;" Rheims: "my just liveth of faith, but if he withdraw himself."—Ὑποστολῆς and πίστεως are abstracts for concretes, and are correctly so rendered in our translation. Compare "*election*," ἐκλογή, in Rom. xi. 7, for *elect*.—"Salvation:" The Greek properly means 'acquisition,' and then 'preservation.'

SECTION VI.

Chap. XI.

FAITH DEFINED AND EXEMPLIFIED.

XI. Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of 2 things not seen. For by it the elders 3 obtained a good report. Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.

Ἔστι δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων. Ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι. Πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν Ἄβελ παρὰ XI. 2 3

Chap. xi. The Apostle begins this most descriptive chapter by a definition of faith. It is rather to the essential character of this grace that he has respect, than to the objects on which it may have to act.

1. " The substance :" rather, confidence, or sure expectation, that which gives being and substantial reality in the mind of the believer to what are the objects of his faith. The Greek word is used in the Septuagint as the translation of the Hebrew for "*hope*." See Ps. xxxviii. 8 ; in the Hebrew xxxix. 8 (Eng. 7.) Its derivation intimates its character as sustaining, supporting ; *ὑπόστασις*, *what stands under*. Cranmer's Bible has " sure confydence ;" the Geneva translation, "ground." In iii. 14, 2 Cor. ix. 4, and xi. 17, it is employed in the sense of confidence.—" The evidence :" or, rather *what* results from evidence, the conviction, persuasion of the truth of. The definition then is to this effect : ' Faith is the confident expectation of objects hoped for, the firm conviction of the reality and truth of things which are not now to be seen.'

2. Μαρτυρέω, *to bear witness*, *to testify*, is used (like the verb, *to visit*,) either in a good or bad sense, to testify *for*, in favour of, or *against*. Here, as in the last verse of the chapter, it means the former.—" The elders" are evidently the patriarchs, and other distinguished religious ancestors of the Hebrews. The author draws his illustrations from Old Testament history, beginning with the book of Genesis, and therefore goes back to the very first fact there recounted.

3. It is faith in God which leads us to receive the scriptural account of the creation.—" Worlds :" the Greek word is a literal translation of a usual Hebrew term, עלמים.—" Were made :" Literally, were *framed* or *prepared*. Thus the original is used in Ps. lxxiii. Sept. (lxxiv. Eng.) 16 :

4 Κάϊν προσήνεγκε τῷ θεῷ, δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος, μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ δι'

By faith Abel offered unto God a 4 more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it he, being dead,

---

"thou hast prepared," established, made, κατηρτίσω, "the sun and the moon," (or, "the light and the sun.") It is also used for *repairing*, *restoring*, &c., which, as Dr. Robinson says, "is the more common classic usage."—"The word of God:" that is, the divine command or will.—The negative particle may be connected with the immediately following participle, or with the verb at the end of the verse. The meaning will be nearly the same. The latter construction is the more usual; although the other may be preferable, if the description is drawn from the Septuagint of Genesis. The author does not assert that the visible objects of creation were made *out of nothing;* (to use a popular phrase, which seems to intimate that *nothing* means *something* which is *not!*) Second Macc. vii. 28, which has often been cited in defence of this view, is not exactly parallel. There the words are, "of things which *are not*," οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων (or ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων.) Still less reason is there to consider the Apostle's words as equivalent to ἐκ νοητῶν, meaning, the Platonic ideas. He has in his mind, most probably, the chaotic state of the substance out of which the creation described in Genesis was framed, as it is represented in the Septuagint version; although, writing perhaps from memory, he does not quote the exact words, still the thought may be the same. That version conveys the idea of 'not clearly visible,' or, 'not to be looked at,' dark, unsightly materials, ἀόρατος, parallel with μὴ φαινομένων. The Scripture does not seem to say anything respecting the origin of the material of things. It speaks uniformly of the creation of previously existing substance into a harmonious world. And had this been duly considered, most probably it would have been perceived, that the usual geological objections to the account in the Pentateuch are unfounded. The old Jewish interpretation of the first verse of Genesis, which I have given from Jarchi in my Companion to the book, p. 130, does certainly deserve to be candidly considered. It is simple, in harmony with the usage of the Hebrew language, and with the account of the creation wherever mentioned in the Bible. According to it, the translation and punctuation of the first words in Genesis will be as follows: 'In the beginning of God's creating the heavens and the earth, the earth was without form and void, (that is, in a chaotic state,) and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And (or but) the Spirit of God moved (or brooded) upon the face of the waters, (the apparently watery mass,) and God said, let there be light!'

4. "Better sacrifice:" The reason uniformly given in the Scriptures

5 yet speaketh. By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, 6 that he pleased God. But without faith *it is* impossible to please *him;* for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and *that* he is a rewarder of them that diligently 7 seek him. By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen

αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ. Πίστει 5 Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη, τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον· καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκετο, διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός· πρὸ γὰρ τῆς μεταθέσεως αὐτοῦ μεμαρτύρηται εὐηρεστηκέναι τῷ θεῷ. Χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐα- 6 ρεστῆσαι· πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ τὸν προσ-ερχόμενον τῷ θεῷ, ὅτι ἐστὶ καὶ τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτὸν μισθαποδότης γίνεται. Πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε περὶ τῶν μη- 7 δέπω βλεπομένων, εὐλαβηθεὶς κατεσ-

---

why Abel's sacrifice was more acceptable than Cain's, is the faithful and religious character of the one brother, and the want of it in the other. See 1 John iii. 12. It has been confidently said that Abel's faith in an atoning Messiah prompted him to the choice of an animal sacrifice, by omitting to offer which Cain showed his infidelity. The choice of the victim may have been the result of such faith, but there is no positive proof. For some additional remarks to this subject, I refer the reader to my Discourses on Prophecy, pp. 33, 34, and Companion to Genesis, pp. 203, 204. In attempting to show the superiority of Abel's sacrifice to Cain's, Owen even goes so far as to intimate that his fruits were "gathered *raptim*, without choice or judgment of what was most meet to be offered," and hence he inculcates the principle that "we are to serve God with the best that we have." The intimation is not only unwarrantable, but censorious. "*Of:*" that is, *respecting;* or, as ancient Jewish tradition reports and in accordance with analogy, *on*, (ἐπί,) by consuming the offering, as in the case of Elijah. See 1 Kings xviii. 38.—"By it:" his faith. It is of very little moment whether we read λαλεῖ, as in the text, or, with some authorities, λαλεῖται, *speaketh or is spoken of:* though the former is certainly the more probable.

5. It is not expressly stated in the Old Testament that Enoch did not die; but the manner in which he is there spoken of is so peculiar, that it cannot have been intended to denote the usual termination of human life. In every other instance specified in the context, it is said, "and he died;" but in his, the language is, "he walked with God," that is, as the author and the Septuagint well explain it, "pleased" him, (Gen. v. 22,) being "agreed" with his divine companion, (Amos iii. 3,) "and was not, for God took him." He removed him, and at an age far below that of his immediate predecessors or followers. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that pious and candid Jews should have come to the same conclusion as the Apostle, and long before his time. See Ecclus. xliv. 16, to which, no doubt, the author alludes.

7. "Moved with fear:" The original participle here used, which is of

κεύασε κιβωτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, δι' ἧς κατέκρινε τὸν κόσμον καὶ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος. Πίστει καλούμενος 8 Ἀβραὰμ ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον, ὃν ἤμελλε λαμβάνειν εἰς κληρονομίαν, καὶ ἐξῆλθε μὴ ἐπιστάμενος 9 ποῦ ἔρχεται. Πίστει παρῴκησεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν, ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας, μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ τῶν συγκληρονόμων τῆς 10 ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς· ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν, ἧς

as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. By 8 faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith 9 he sojourned in the land of promise, as *in* a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: for he looked for a city which 10 hath foundations, whose builder and

---

the same origin as the noun which terminates v. 7, may imply the religious nature of Noah's fear.—"By which" faith, as shown in the general course of his life.—"He condemned:" This is either *prophetic*, meaning, predicted its condemnation, as in Gen. xlix. 7, "I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel," for, I predict their dispersion; or declarative, equivalent to, pronounced its condemnation.—"And became (or was,) heir:" That is, he continued to be what he already was; his faith, through the exercise of which he had become acceptable to God, continued to preserve him so. In a similar sense St. James says that "Abraham was justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar," ii. 21; meaning, no doubt, that by this acceptable act of faithful obedience, he continued to be in God's favour. Language which, when most accurately used, expresses the origin of any thing, is often employed in Scripture to denote its continuance. Hence the phrases to *make* or *enter into* a covenant for to *continue* and *ratify* it, to *build* a city for to *rebuild*, *beautify* and *adorn* it; to *be baptized* into Moses for to *sanction* and *confirm* connection with him which had taken place before. Comp. Ps. l. 5, 2 Chron. xv. 12, 1 Cor. x. 2.

9, 10. "With Isaac and Jacob:" that is, as well as they. Compare the use of the preposition in Luke xi. 7, "with me" as well as myself; Phil. iv. 3, "with Clement also," that is, as well as he.—"Dwelling in tents:" This means, having on earth no settled and permanent resting-place, as the antithesis in the next verse shows. Thus it is said of Jacob in Gen. xxv. 27, that he "was" (not "a plain man," according to our vague English translation, which loosely expresses the sense of the Septuagint and some other ancient authorities, but) 'a perfect' or 'religious man,' "dwelling in tents." See the note in the Companion to Genesis, pp. 296–302.—The "city which hath foundations," which is well founded and sure, is the heavenly

11 maker *is* God. Through faith also Sarah herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who 12 had promised. Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, *so many* as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumer- 13 able. These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced *them*, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. 14 For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a

τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ θεός. Πίστει καὶ αὐτὴ Σάῤῥα δύναμιν εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος ἔλαβε καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας ἔτεκεν, ἐπεὶ πιστὸν ἡγήσατο τὸν ἐπαγγειλάμενον. 11 *Διὸ καὶ ἀφ' ἑνὸς ἐγεννήθησαν, καὶ ταῦτα νενεκρωμένου, καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει καὶ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ ἀναρίθμητος.* 12 *Κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ πόῤῥωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι, καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες, ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.* 13 *Οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες ἐμφανίζουσιν, ὅτι* 14

---

residence, which is here put in contradistinction to the insecure and moveable habitation of the patriarchs. Compare the language employed to denote the body in 2 Cor. v. 1, 2.

11. The attempt of Michaelis and some others to explain this of Abraham's faith by making "Sarah herself" a dative, cannot be sustained. Sarah's own faith is what is commended, notwithstanding her occasional doubt, in which the patriarch himself participated. See Gen. xviii. 12–15, and xvii. 17, 18. Her humble piety is also proposed as an example in 1 Pet. iii. 5, 6. Her receiving strength to become a mother relates to the natural weakness of her old age.—"To conceive seed," *εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος*: probably, 'for the founding of offspring.' The word is often used in reference to the creation or founding of the world, as in iv. 3, ix. 26, and elsewhere, and may express the idea of laying the foundation of a family. Bloomfield says that "this sense is frigid and does not suit the words following." I am at a loss to see why. He analyzes the phrase so as to give it the sense of our English translation; and so also Robinson in his Lexicon under *καταβολή*, 2. The use of the word by Greek authors agrees with this view; but, as the Hellenistic usage of *καταβολή* when applied to the world and of *σπέρμα* as a common term for offspring, is favourable to the other, and as we are thus relieved from the necessity of adopting a disagreeable exposition, I prefer the interpretation first given. Kuinoel considers this as "beyond all doubt" the true meaning.—I have retained the word *ἔτεκεν* in the text, although Hahn omits it. The Syriac version gives it, and the intention of the divine promise is thereby the more clearly expressed.

12–16. *Ταῦτα* probably for *κατὰ ταῦτα*.—It may admit of doubt whether

15 *πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσι. Καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης ἐμνημόνευον, ἀφ' ἧς ἐξῆλθον, εἶχον* 16 *ἂν καιρὸν ἀνακάμψαι· νῦν δὲ κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐπουρανίου· διὸ οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός, θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν· ἡτοίμασε γὰρ* 17 *αὐτοῖς πόλιν. Πίστει προσενήνοχεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ πειραζόμενος, καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερεν ὁ τὰς ἐπαγ-*

country. And truly if they had 15 been mindful of that *country* from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a bet- 16 ter *country*, that is, a heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he hath prepared for them a city. By faith 17 Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac; and he that had received the promises, offered up his

---

"all these" is to be explained of the multitudes, or of the faithful ones just before mentioned. Those who question the general application object that the description is not suited to the mass, as a very large proportion of them had no such faithful longings after heaven, and were censured and punished by God in various ways. This is certainly true, and therefore we are compelled to limit the application of the words to the Hebrew people as a body of faithful men, exclusive of the very many exceptions. The language is of too general a nature to be restricted to the few individuals before mentioned. It is hardly possible to read the two verses without feeling that the expression "all these" relates to the progeny whose vast number had been compared to the stars and the sand. The description of circumstances and character which follows is, no doubt, particularly adapted to that of the leading patriarchs. But if the reader will fastidiously cling to the most accurate meaning, and therefore limit its application to the faithful few before mentioned, let him consider that consistency compels him to apply the limitation to such a degree as to exclude all but Abraham, Sarah, and Jacob! For, strictly speaking, it is said in ver. 15 of "all these," that they might have returned to the country from which they had come out, that is, Mesopotamia, of which Abraham and Sarah were natives and Jacob had for a long time been a resident. Compare also ver. 39. The language is popular, but such as we should not scruple to use. No Christian would hesitate to say, that the members of his church from its remotest period had all died in the faith, while he would not mean to comprehend its irreligious portion.—For "now," see the note on viii. 6.—"Ashamed:" Compare ii. 11.

17–19. "Offered up:" Fastidious critics may object that Isaac was not really offered, as the sacrifice was prevented by divine interference. But the offering, both as regards the faithful and devoted father and also the pious and submissive son, most certainly did essentially take place. The natural feelings and inclinations of both were sacrificed to the will of God. And the Jews do not hesitate to represent the transaction as if Isaac

18 only begotten *son*, of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be 19 called, accounting that God *was* able to raise *him* up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him 20 in a figure. By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things 21 to come. By faith Jacob, when he

γελίας ἀναδεξάμενος, πρὸς ὃν ἐλαλήθη· 18 ὅτι ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα· λογισάμενος, ὅτι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν 19 δυνατὸς ὁ θεός· ὅθεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο. Πίστει περὶ μελ- 20 λόντων εὐλόγησεν Ἰσαὰκ τὸν Ἰακὼβ καὶ τὸν Ἠσαῦ. Πίστει Ἰακὼβ ἀπο- 21

---

had really been burned to ashes.* Virgil also uses the same sort of language with respect to Iphigenia, although she was not actually offered: Sanguine placastis ventos, et virgine *cæsa*. Æneid, Lib. ii. ver. 116.—"Only begotten son:" meaning his only son by his only and long-loved wife, Sarah. His other son was by a slave and concubine; and therefore, in common with his children by Keturah, (who is introduced in Genesis after Sarah's death,) was in a very marked manner distinguished from Isaac, whom he made his heir in the fullest sense of the words. See Gen. xxv. 5, 6.—"Accounting:" or reasoning.—"Able:" willingness is of course implied. A careful examination of the narrative in Gen. xxii. will show that the author's conclusion here expressed, or that of a divine interference to prevent the sacrifice, are the only ones that can be drawn consistently with the circumstances.†—"In a figure:" As the word *παραβολή* is used in ix. 9, of the old covenant as symbolical of the new, some commentators have translated it here in the same way, 'for a symbol,' meaning that Isaac's sacrifice was typical of Christ's. This is most probably true, whether asserted here or not. Tholuck understands *ἐν παραβόλῃ* to mean, 'in (or with) difficulty,' and explains the clause thus: 'whence (from death,) he with difficulty brought him off.' I should prefer regarding it as elliptical for, 'speaking figuratively.' The figure may be drawn either from the circumstances of Isaac's birth, the natural condition of his parents, as expressed above in vs. 11, 12, and in Rom. iv. 19; or, more probably, his exposure to immediate danger of death at the time of the sacrifice.

21. "Dying:" that is, when about to die; it may be, during his last illness, but this is uncertain. The narrative in Genesis, runs thus: "And the time drew nigh that Isaac must die," &c. He requires his son Joseph to assure him by an oath, that he shall be interred "in the burying place of" his "fathers." Then follows, in the Septuagint, the language of the latter half of this verse. See Gen. xlvii. 29–31. The scene of the patriarch's

* See Levi's Prayer for the New Year in McCaul's Old Paths, No. xxxv. p. 375. This is a very curious and valuable collection of tracts, written by one of the best Hebrew scholars in England, the Rev. Alexander McCaul, D.D., Prof. of Divinity, King's College, Lond. The publication was designed to show the Jews the utter inconsistency of Rabbinical traditions with their own inspired Scriptures. Every one who engages in missionary efforts among the Jews, ought to be perfectly familiar with McCaul's Old Paths, and conversant with the Jewish Rabbies. A very handsome edition in 8vo, pp. 660, was published in London in 1846.

† See Companion to Genesis, note 94, pp. 287, 288.

θνήσκων ἕκαστον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰωσὴφ εὐλό-γησε, καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον	was a dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph; and worshipped, *leaning*

death occurs in chap. xlix.—"Worshipped on the top of his staff:" This is elliptical for, leaning on. It is very probable that Jacob regarded his old staff with deep feeling as an agreeable memento of God's goodness to him. It is certain that the staff with which he had wandered away from his father's house to escape the vengeance of his brother, he had carefully kept during his sojourn in Mesopotamia, and that he had made it the companion of his return. See Gen. xxxii. 10. A man of any feeling could not but value it on account of the associations therewith connected, and the religious character of Jacob would prompt expressions of gratitude and faith. It is natural therefore that his trusty staff should be used to support his aged frame in its devotional posture. The Rheims and Douay Bible supposes the staff or rod to have been Joseph's wand or badge of office, his sceptre. It follows the Vulgate which has, adoravit fastigium virgæ *ejus;* he adored the top of *his* wand, that is, Joseph's, not Jacob's, which would have required *suæ.* It is remarkable that the same Vulgate translates the place in Genesis, adoravit Israel Deum conversus ad lectuli caput, Israel adored God, having turned to the bed's head. The note in the Bible just mentioned speaks of "Jacob's acknowledging and reverencing the power of Joseph, whom Pharaoh called the saviour of the world." It says also "that probably Jacob, by the spirit of prophecy, knew Joseph and his power to be figures of Christ and his spiritual power," and that Jacob "paid a religious honour and veneration to the top of the rod or sceptre of Joseph as a figure of Christ's sceptre and kingdom." But this is wholly unfounded. Neither the Hebrew nor the Greek determines the staff to be either Joseph's or the sceptre or rod of office. Kuettner, as quoted by Peile, p. 379, ventures to say that "Joseph had come to his father's bearing a sceptre!" The reader may wonder where he got this important piece of information from, and his wonder will not be diminished by being told that he derives it from the Wisdom of Solomon, x. 14, which says nothing of the sort. And yet he makes this idle supposition the ground of his exposition, which is cited by Peile in company with that of Calvin and Athanasius. Peile himself translates: "*and bowed himself toward* (made obeisance unto) *the* outstretched (!) *tip of his* (Joseph's) *sceptre.*" Tyndale also and Cranmer both have the phrase "bowed hym selfe towarde." But the proposition ἐπί is never used in the Bible of worshipping or making obeisance *toward* the object intended to be honoured. The word προσκυνέω, to worship, &c., occurs very often; yet always, according to Trommius' Concordance, either without any preposition at all of the object, or with εἰς, ἐναντι, ἐναντίον, ἐνώπιον κατά, κατέναντι and προς. When ἐπί is employed, it is either connected with τὴν γῆν, the ground, expressing the degree of outward obeisance, or

22 upon the top of his staff. By faith Joseph, when he died, made mention

τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ. Πίστει Ἰωσήφ τελ- 22 ευτῶν περὶ τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσ-

---

has reference to the *place* of the worship, in which sense κατά and πρός are also used. Thus in Ezek. xlvi. 3: "worship *at* the door," ἐπί and afterwards κατά; and Zeph. i. 5: "worship *on* the houses the host of heaven," ἐπὶ τά δώματα τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. The latter passage is a striking illustration of the usage; for the dative marks the object and the preposition the place of the worship. In 1 Kings i. 47, we have a confirmation of the correctness of the usual Protestant translation of the text in Hebrews; "and the king worshipped *upon* (resting on) his bed," προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην αὐτοῦ. In the prayer of Solomon we read of praying *toward* the holy place or land, and Daniel prays with his windows open *toward* Jerusalem; but *in every such case* the preposition employed is either εἰς or κατέναντι. See in the Septuagint 1 Kings viii. 29, 30, 35, 38, 42, Dan. vi. 10.

Although the translation followed in the epistle is quite admissible, and may be the true one, yet our English version gives the exact sense of the Hebrew. The word for *bed* differs from that for *staff* or *wand* only by the change of the vowel points, and as these were not written when the Septuagint was made, the translation is easily accounted for. Probably the simple meaning in Genesis is, that the devout patriarch turned his face to the head of his couch in order to avoid observation and the better to concentrate his thoughts. It has been objected that eastern beds, properly speaking, had no heads; to which it may seem sufficient to reply that the end of the couch on which the head was placed, became practically "the bed's head." Both Symmachus and Aquila retain the word "bed;" and this meaning is in harmony with 1 Kings i. 47, "and the king bowed himself upon the bed;" for although the Hebrew word there employed is different from that in Genesis, yet the whole turn of the expression is the same. Compare also for the general sentiment, 2 Kings xx. 2, "then he turned his face to the wall and prayed."

22. See Gen. l. 24, 25. The direction of Joseph to have his bones removed from Egypt at the period of the exode, is a very remarkable illustration of his faith in the divine word, and of his desire that his remains should rest in the promised land. The second distinguished personage in the world-renowned Egypt, and its most illustrious benefactor, could certainly have commanded the most splendid among the mausoleums of a country, the tombs of whose kings are among the wonders of the world. Yet in the very height of his glory, he directed that his descendants, who he knew were to be reduced to slavery, should remove his bones from their magnificent place of deposit, and carry them to the residence which God had allotted to his nation.

ραὴλ ἐμνημόνευσε καὶ περὶ τῶν ὀστέων
23 *αὐτοῦ ἐνετείλατο.* Πίστει Μωϋσῆς *γεννηθεὶς ἐκρύβη τρίμηνον ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ, διότι εἶδον ἀστεῖον τὸ παιδίον, καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ διά-*
24 *ταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως.* Πίστει Μωϋσῆς *μέγας γενόμενος ἠρνήσατο λέγεσθαι υἱὸς*
25 *θυγατρὸς Φαραώ, μᾶλλον ἑλόμενος συγκακουχεῖσθαι τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ πρόσ-*
26 *καιρον ἔχειν ἁμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσιν, μείζονα πλοῦτον ἡγησάμενος τῶν Αἰγύπτου θησαυρῶν τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἀπέβλεπε γὰρ εἰς τὴν μισθαποδο-*
27 *σίαν.* Πίστει *κατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον, μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως· τὸν*

of the departing of the children of Israel; and gave commandment concerning his bones. By faith Moses, 23 when he was born, was hid three months of his parents, because they saw *he was* a proper child; and they were not afraid of the king's commandment. By faith Moses, when 24 he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer af- 25 fliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of 26 Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompence of the reward. By faith he forsook Egypt, not fear- 27 ing the wrath of the king; for he endured, as seeing him who is in-

---

23. Πατέρες, though properly *fathers*, is sometimes used for *parents.*—Ἀστεῖον, beautiful, or fine, perhaps more striking in appearance than children in general. Comp. Acts vii. 20, where the term occurs with the word for God, making it a strong superlative. The king's edict induced the parents to conceal the child, but not to put him to death as it required.

26. "Reproach of Christ:" That is, say some, reproach sustained in consequence of his faith in an expected Messiah; but rather, according to others, such reproach as Christ and his followers endured. Thus Storr, who thinks that the apostle intends to guard the Hebrews against being scandalized at Christ's humiliation, and therefore tells them that Moses himself, before his advancement to be their lawgiver and head, was subjected to obloquy and suffering. See xiii. 13, where "his reproach" means, such as that which he endured; 2 Cor. iv. 10, "the dying of the Lord Jesus," that is, a condition like that of his of constant exposure to death; Rev. xv. 3, "the Song of Moses," such a hymn of praise as he sang on the deliverance from the Egyptians at the Red Sea.

27, 28. The author undoubtedly refers here to the exode, and not to the flight of Moses mentioned in Exod. ii. 15. The general fact of leaving Egypt is first stated, and then some of the particulars connected with it. "The wrath of the king" most probably alludes to the last interview between Pharaoh and Moses as recounted in Exod. x. 28, xi. 8, where the king is left "in great anger."—"He kept:" celebrated, as ποιέω is used in Luke xxii. 19, and 1 Cor. xi. 24.

31. Certain expositors, both Jewish and Christian, have maintained

28 visible. Through faith he kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the first-born 29 should touch them. By faith they passed through the Red Sea as by dry *land;* which the Egyptians as- 30 saying to do, were drowned. By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they were compassed about 31 seven days. By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received 32 the spies with peace. And what shall I more say? for the time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and *of* Barak, and *of* Samson, and *of* Jephthah; *of* David also, and Samuel,

γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκαρτέρησε. Πίστει πεποίηκε τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος, ἵνα μὴ ὁ ὀλοθρεύων τὰ πρωτότοκα θίγῃ αὐτῶν. 28 *Πίστει διέβησαν τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς, ἧς πεῖραν λαβόντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι κατεπόθησαν.* 29 *Πίστει τὰ τείχη Ἱεριχὼ ἔπεσε, κυκλωθέντα ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας.* 30 *Πίστει Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐ συναπώλετο τοῖς ἀπειθήσασι, δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκόπους μετ' εἰρήνης.* 31 *Καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω; ἐπιλείψει γάρ με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος περὶ Γεδεών, Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψὼν καὶ Ἰεφθάε, Δαυΐδ τε καὶ* 32

---

that Rahab was an entertainer of travellers, a *hostess*, and that both the Hebrew and Greek allow this translation, the latter *πόρνη* being derived from *περνάω*, to sell, and the former זונה from זון, to feed. But though the Greek word may have this derivation, the Hebrew must be drawn from another root, זנה, of which it is the regular participle. This word in its various forms and with affixes occurs about 130 times in the Old Testament, and always has the sense here assigned to it; whereas the other is found only four or five times, and in the later Hebrew books. Indeed it is more properly Chaldee. In both Hebrew and Greek usage decides in favour of the generally received meaning, harlot. Jewish authorities followed the Chaldee Targum. But in all probability, the translation there given arose from a wish to make the ancestry of David somewhat more respectable, and this was in accordance with national pride. The Christian commentators who have given the same view, seem to have been influenced by a desire to vindicate from reproach the moral character of the woman whose faith is here eulogized. But it should be considered that although Rahab may have been noted for her vicious life, it does not follow that she was continuing the same course at the time of her receiving the spies; and moreover, that the praise of her faith in God's promises to settle the Hebrews in her native land, does not apply to her whole life or character. We are under no obligation to vindicate her even from deceit and falsehood in her communication to the messengers of the king of Jericho stated in Josh. ii. 4, 5. True faith in the divine promise and power may be compatible with much that is censurable. The remark is most especially applicable in the case of Samson. His faith is eminently praiseworthy and to be imitated; his subjection to evil passions to be pitied, deplored and condemned.

32–38. The instances of faith here enumerated are taken from the

33 *Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, οἳ διὰ πίστεως κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας, εἰργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην, ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν, ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων,* 34 *ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρός, ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας, ἐνεδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ,* 35 *παρεμβολὰς ἔκλιναν ἀλλοτρίων· ἔλαβον γυναῖκες ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν, οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἵνα* 36 *κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν· ἕτεροι δὲ ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ μαστίγων πεῖραν ἔλα-* 37 *βον, ἔτι δὲ δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῆς· ἐλι-*

and *of* the prophets; who through 33 faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quench- 34 ed the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their 35 dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: And others had trial 36 of *cruel* mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment. They were stoned, 37

---

books of Judges and Samuel, and allusions are made to facts narrated by the later historians and prophets, extending most probably to the Maccabean period.—"Wrought righteousness:" this can hardly be restricted to living religiously; most probably it means, 'effected God's righteous purposes by delivering his oppressed people and inflicting punishment on their enemies.'—"Stopped the mouths of lions" &c., seems to have a special reference to Dan. vi. 23, and iii. 27.—The 35th verse probably alludes to the restoration of the children mentioned in 1 Kings xvii. 17–23 and 2 Kings iv. 32–37; and also to the faithful constancy of the pious Jews during the period of the persecution of Antiochus: see 2 Mac. vi. vii. In vi. 19, 28, *τύμπανον*, rendered in the English "torment," is mentioned as an instrument of punishment, to which there seems to be an allusion here in the word *ἐτυμπανίσθησαν*, were tortured or beaten to death. See Robinson and Passow. With the latter half of the verse compare particularly vii. 9, "shall raise us up, *ἀναστήσει*, unto everlasting life;" ver. 14, "resurrection to life;" ver. 23, "give you life again;" ver. 29, "I may receive thee again."—"Better resurrection:" that is, say some, a resurrection to everlasting happiness, and therefore better than that restoration to temporal life which the cases related in the Kings refer to. But most probably the Apostle means that the future glorious resurrection which those Maccabean and other martyrs expected, is vastly better than all the present immunities and enjoyments which might have been secured by disobedience to the divine law.—"Imprisonment:" as in the case of Micaiah, 1 Kings xxii. 27, and Jeremiah, xxxvii. 15–21, xxxviii. 6 et seq.—"Stoned:" a common mode of execution with the ancient Hebrews. For an instance see the account of the death of Zechariah in 2 Chron. xxiv. 21, 22.—"Sawn asunder:" This refinement of cruelty was often practised by eastern despots, and there is an old tradition that Isaiah suffered

they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, af-
38 flicted, tormented; (of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered in deserts, and *in* mountains, and *in* dens and caves of the earth.
39 And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received

ἐπρίσθησαν, ἐπειράσθησαν ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον· περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν, ὑστερούμενοι, θλιβόμενοι, κακουχούμενοι, ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος, ἐν 38 ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι καὶ ὄρεσι καὶ σπηλαίοις καὶ ταῖς ὀπαῖς τῆς γῆς. Καὶ 39 οὗτοι πάντες, μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς

---

this barbarous death, inflicted by the order of Manasseh. See Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho, Thirlby's edition, p. 395, with notes 17, 18. In common with some other fathers, he speaks of a wooden saw being used, which, in his usual manner, he regards as typical of the cross. Jerome also mentions the same tradition. Comment on Isa. lvii. 2, in Opera, Tom. iii. Col. 414, Edit. Martianay, Paris, 1704.—"Were tempted:" tried in various ways. Hypercritics, both ancient and modern, supposing this to be too mild a term to accord with the severities represented in the context, have conjectured various readings expressive of terrific deaths, particularly burning, the Greek for which is very like that for tempted; the latter being *ἐπειράσθησαν* and the former *ἐπυράσθησαν*. But the weight of authority in favour of the received reading is decisive. The external evidence is overwhelming, and no objection of much weight can be urged on internal grounds. It comprehends the various kinds and degrees of trial and temptation, which might be presented to lure the soul from the rugged and painful path of duty.—"In deserts and mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth:" The cases alluded to are doubtless those of David, the prophets mentioned by Obadiah, Elijah and others. See 1 Sam. xxii. 1, xxxiii. 14 et seq., xxiv. 3, 1 Kings xviii. 4, 13, xix. 9, 2 Mac. vi. 11.

39, 40. "The promise:" meaning its full accomplishment. Comp. ver. 13.—"Provided:" properly 'looked out for before,' in allusion, Tholuck thinks, to the Gospel plan of redemption having been before determined in the divine mind.—"That they without us should not be made perfect:" *Χωρὶς ἡμῶν·* apart from, or independently of us. Hallet infers from this text, that "the ancient saints did pass into a state of sleep until the coming of Christ, and that Christians when they die do immediately pass into happiness and glory. The thing therefore," says he, "that we have which is better than what they had, cannot possibly be any other than our being received into heaven and into the enjoyment of God *immediately* upon our leaving this world." These notions are founded on a misapprehension of certain texts in the Old Testament, and of the nature and degree of the perfection here spoken of. Several of the fathers expound the text of perfect happiness hereafter. Thus Theodoret in loc. compares the Apostle's

πίστεως, οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγ- 40 *γελίαν, τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν κρεῖττόν τι προβλεψαμένου, ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσι.*	not the promise; God having pro- 40 vided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.

representation to a contest, the earlier victors not being crowned before the later, and none until the games are entirely ended, when all are together proclaimed conquerors.* To the same purpose Theophylact.† Chrysostom also speaks of the old departed worthies not enjoying perfect happiness until Christians do, and represents Abraham and Paul as waiting for their perfection and ultimate reward.‡ But this cannot be the author's meaning. He does not refer to ultimate happiness after the resurrection, for then all are in the same general circumstances, and we in no better than they; nor to immediate happiness after death, for either theirs was before ours or both are together, and in neither case has any thing better been provided for us. The perfection spoken of relates to the vast superiority of the Gospel dispensation over those preceding. This is the only meaning that harmonizes with the use of perfect and perfection throughout the epistle. Comp. x. 1, ix. 9, viii. 6. Hammond gives in general the same view: "God having reserved for the Christian church some performance of promise, which he had not afforded those former. By this it is apparent that eternal bliss in another world was not the matter of this promise. If it were supposed to be true, as some vainly conceive, that those that died before Christ did not obtain their bliss till after Christ's resurrection, yet it will be acknowledged by all that they then received it, and then it will follow that the Christians had not any advantage of them that lived before, in that respect, those obtaining the bliss as soon or sooner than they. It follows that the better thing was somewhat which the Christians should enjoy in this life." Thus also Capel in loc.§ Those who refer the perfection spoken of to the glory of soul and body when they shall be hereafter united mistake the Apostle's meaning; for in this respect we have no superiority over the patriarchs. His comparison relates not to the condition of the dead but of the living, to the state of the church which was vastly better and more perfect under the Christian dispensation than before. Much of the supposed obscurity of this text is removed by keeping in mind the scriptural representation, that the ancient saints still live and form one company with us on earth, as is expressly stated in the next chapter, and that both parties now enjoy the state of perfection referred to, although of course in different degrees and by different manners and methods of communication.

* Tom. iii. p. 452.

† Tom. ii. p. 744.

‡ Hom. in Heb. xxviii. Opera, Tom. xii. p. 255.

§ Critici Sacri, Tom. vii. P. ii. p. 1130.

SECTION VII.

CHAP. XII. XIII.

EXHORTATIONS TO PERSEVERANCE AND OTHER CHRISTIAN VIRTUES: CONCLUSION.

XII. Wherefore, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset *us*, and let us run with patience the race that is 2 set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of *our* faith; who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the

XII. Τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς, τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων, ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα καὶ τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν, δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχωμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα, 2 ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν, ὃς ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς ὑπέμεινε σταυρόν, αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας, ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ

CHAP. xii. 1, 2. In the first verses of this chapter the language is agonistic.—"Cloud:" a common figure for multitude. See Isa. lx. 8, and the Greek and Latin passages quoted by Stuart.—"Weight:" what might impede the racer's progress.—"Easily beset:" literally, *well* or favourably *circumstanced.* The reader may find various and abundant learning relating to this word in Tholuck.—"Looking unto:" properly, *looking steadfastly to*, or *looking away from* all opposing objects and interests *to* Jesus.—"The author:" In ii. 10, the same word is rendered "captain," and in Acts iii. 15, "prince." Jesus is said to be "the author and finisher of the faith," because it originated with and is brought to perfection by him. Faith here may comprehend both the system and the principle in the mind of the believer.—Κεκάθικεν is preferable to the common reading ἐκάθισεν: it means hath set down, and implies continuance.

3–11. "Contradiction:" that is, opposition.—"My son," &c. See Prov. iii. 11, 12, "Chastisement:" better, discipline. It is connected with sonship, and is a proof of affection. The Apostle does not mean, what sort of a son is he whom the father does not discipline? but there is no true son who is not, by a wise and judicious father, subjected to discipline: the illegitimate, the supposititious, and spurious, the comparatively uncared for, is undisciplined.—εἶτα μέν, then indeed; meaning, then also.—"Father of our flesh:" The reference is to Num. xvi. 22, "the God of the spirits of all flesh." It is not intended to intimate either in the Pentateuch or in the epistle that God is not the father also of our flesh or bodies; but to de-

3 θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκάθικεν. Ἀναλογίσασθε γὰρ τὸν τοιαύτην ὑπομεμενηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀντιλογίαν, ἵνα μὴ κάμητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ἐκλυόμενοι.

4 Οὔπω μέχρις αἵματος ἀντικατέστητε 5 πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι· καὶ ἐκλέλησθε τῆς παρακλήσεως, ἥτις ὑμῖν ὡς υἱοῖς διαλέγεται· υἱέ μου, μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου, μηδὲ ἐκλύου ὑπ' 6 αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος· ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ κύριος, παιδεύει, μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα 7 υἱόν, ὃν παραδέχεται. Εἰ παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, ὡς υἱοῖς ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ θεός· τίς γάρ ἐστιν υἱός, ὃν οὐ παι-8 δεύει πατήρ; Εἰ δὲ χωρίς ἐστε παιδείας, ἧς μέτοχοι γεγόνασι πάντες, ἄρα 9 νόθοι ἐστὲ καὶ οὐχ υἱοί. Εἶτα τοὺς μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας εἴχομεν παι-

right hand of the throne of God. 3 For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds.

4 Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, 5 striving against sin. And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him: 6 for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. 7 If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? 8 But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons. 9 Furthermore,

---

note the vast superiority of the spiritual part to the corporeal, and that the former is especially the object of divine care. That he has any regard to physiological or psychological theories bearing on traducianism or creationism, is wholly improbable.—Δοκεῖ, "seemeth:" See on iv. 1.

12. 'Strengthen the relaxed arms and the enfeebled knees.'—It is of little consequence whether the figure is taken, as some commentators think, from pugilists; or as others, from racers. "Lift up," ἀνορθώσατε, is appropriate in either case. Properly it means, *place erect again;* but here it is used in the sense of *strengthen.*—"Straight:" This is the meaning of the original, which however comprehends the idea of level. In a straight and level path the lame or weak in limb would be the less likely to slip or fall or be turned aside. Some have translated ἐκτραπῇ, be dislocated, (Stuart, "sprained, wrenched,") in order to preserve the figure. But such rhetorical nicety is unnecessary. In common with most of the biblical writers, the author runs the figure and the thing signified into each other.

15. "Root of bitterness," or bitter root. In the Bible, root, sucker, plant, sprout, branch, twig, are words of the same general import, and they mean, production. The idea that *root* must indicate *source* is a mistake. It is often used as a part for the whole. In Rev. xxii. 16, the two words "root and offspring," express precisely the same thing, namely, descendant; although eloquent preachers and popular commentators have inferred therefrom our Lord's *divinity* and *humanity.* In Deut. xxix. 18, we have "a *root* that beareth gall and wormwood," for a wicked and idolatrous person;

we have had fathers of our flesh, which corrected *us;* and we gave *them* reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father 10 of Spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened *us* after their own pleasure; but he for *our* profit that *we* might be partakers 11 of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are 12 exercised thereby. Wherefore lift up the hands which hang down, and 13 the feeble knees: and make straight paths for your feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way; 14 but let it rather be healed. Follow peace with all *men*, and holiness, without which no man shall see the

δευτάς, καὶ ἐνετρεπόμεθα· οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὑποταγησόμεθα τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων, καὶ ζήσομεν; Οἱ μὲν γὰρ 10 *πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς ἐπαίδευον· ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον, εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ. Πᾶσα δὲ παιδεία πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν οὐ* 11 *δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι, ἀλλὰ λύπης· ὕστερον δὲ καρπὸν εἰρηνικὸν τοῖς δι' αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις ἀποδίδωσι δικαιοσύνης. Διὸ* 12 *τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα ἀνορθώσατε, καὶ τροχιὰς* 13 *ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν, ἵνα μὴ τὸ χωλὸν ἐκτραπῇ, ἰαθῇ δὲ μᾶλλον. Εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων καὶ τὸν* 14 *ἁγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν*

---

and in 1 Macc. i. 10, Antiochus is called "a wicked *root.*" These passages are analogous to the text. The same term, as a figure, in the sense of offspring, production, is used of Christ. See Isa. liii. 2, "a *root* out of a dry ground;" Ecclus. xlvii. 22, "a *root* unto David."

16. "One morsel of meat:" Rather one meal, or feeding. Many commentators have affirmed that Esau is here called "profane," because in selling his birthright, he parted with the sacred privileges of the priestly office; assuming that these were a part of the rights of the eldest son. But this cannot be proved. Precedence over the younger brothers, and a double portion of the patrimonial estate, appertained to the first-born. See Gen. xlix. 3, 4, Deut. xxi. 17, and 1 Chron. v. 1, 2. The Chaldee Targum on the first text does indeed comprehend the priestly authority as a part of Reuben's rights of primogeniture. And in Exod. xxiv. 5, it explains "young men" by *first-born*, and so do Jarchi and Aben Ezra; and Bishop Pearson says they were so "without question."* But the Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac, and Samaritan Pentateuch, retain the proper meaning of the Hebrew, *young men;* and there is no evidence which enables us to determine whether they were eldest sons or not. If it could be shown that the priestly office constituted a part of the birthright, Esau's being called a profane person for thus parting with it, would of course be clearly explicable. But this is the very point to be proved. The epithet would be equally proper, if, in selling his birthright, Esau abandoned the honour of becoming

* On the Creed, Art. ii., And in Jesus Christ, p. 95, 5th Edit. Lond. 1683, fol.

15 *κύριον· ἐπισκοποῦντες, μή τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ, μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ καὶ διὰ* 16 *ταύτης μιανθῶσι πολλοὶ, μή τις πόρνος ἢ βέβηλος ὡς Ἠσαῦ, ὃς ἀντὶ βρώσεως* 17 *μιᾶς ἀπέδοτο τὰ πρωτοτόκια αὐτοῦ. Ἴστε γάρ, ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομῆσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν ἀπεδοκιμάσθη· μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὗρε, καίπερ*

Lord: looking diligently lest any 15 man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble *you*, and thereby many be defiled; lest there *be* any fornicator, 16 or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know how that after- 17 ward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected: for

---

the progenitor of the promised giver of spiritual life, supposed, whether rightly or not, to belong to the first-born. This would be sufficient evidence of profanity.—The idea that Esau could be in danger of death for want of food in his father's house is preposterous. His language is of that extravagant hyperbolic kind, which could be occasioned by nothing less than a vehement desire for the food before him, and a very low estimate of the value of what was demanded for it. See Companion to Genesis, Note 105, pp. 302, 303.

17. "Place of repentance:" The Geneva translation most unwarrantably introduces the pronoun, "*his* repentance." The meaning is not that Esau found no opportunity of repenting, however earnestly he sought it, and therefore remained an incorrigible sinner. If the author had thought thus, he would hardly have joined him with his brother Jacob as a recipient of his father's blessing, xi. 20.* The word "repentance" here signifies a change in his father's mind. "When he wolde have inherited the blessinge, he was put by, and he found no means to come therby agayne:" Tyndale. Isaac had intended and wished to impart the great benediction to his elder son; but, as under the influence of divine Providence he had been led to bestow it on the younger, he feels that it is not with him to change his mind or to endeavour to alter God's plan; and therefore he does not attempt to recal the blessing of Jacob, but on the contrary confirms it. Esau's expostulation and his "exceeding bitter cry," accompanied by weeping, can effect no alteration of his father's purpose. See Gen. xxvii. 33–38. This sense of the word is by no means unusual. Thus God says in Hosea, xiii. 14, "repentance shall be hid from mine eyes," a change of my mind is entirely out of view; and in Rom. xi. 29, we read that "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance," they are matters with regard to which he does not alter his purpose. The language in which Virgil makes Anna address her sister Dido, is an apt illustration of that in the text: istam Oro, si quis adhuc precibus locus, exue mentem. Æneid, iv. 319.

* On the respective characters of Esau and Jacob, I beg to refer the reader to the Companion before mentioned, Note 104, pp. 296–302.

he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with 18 tears. For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tem-19 pest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which *voice* they that heard, entreated that the word should not be spoken to them 20 any more: for they could not endure that which was commanded,

μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν. Οὐ γὰρ 18 προσεληλύθατε ψηλαφωμένῳ ὄρει καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ καὶ γνόφῳ καὶ σκότῳ καὶ θυέλλῃ καὶ σάλπιγγος ἤχῳ καὶ 19 φωνῇ ῥημάτων, ἧς οἱ ἀκούσαντες παρῃτήσαντο, μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον· οὐκ ἔφερον γὰρ τὸ διαστελλόμενον· 20 κἂν θηρίον θίγῃ τοῦ ὄρους, λιθοβολη-

---

Peile calls the view which refers the change of mind not to Esau but his father Isaac, "a desperate expedient." It would be difficult to give a good reason for so describing it. The exposition is simple, natural, and in harmony with the facts.

18–24. The general thought seems to be this: you are not connected with a dispensation of terrour like that of the law which was given with the most awful restrictions and sanctions, but with one of favour and mild benevolence, namely, the Gospel.—"For" is illative, the blessed condition of Christians being the motive whereby obedience is enjoined.—"You have come:" This is not to be regarded as future; it expresses what has already begun to exist. The heavenly condition of true Christians is a present fact, the blessings and glories of which are to be eternally developing and increasing. Christians are already connected with happy spirits and with angels. See Eph. i. 10, iii. 15, Col. i. 20. The allusion in προσεληλύθατε is doubtless to the Hebrews having come to Mount Sinai, which is expressed in Deut. iv. 11, in the Septuagint, by this very verb.—"The mount that might be touched:" The prohibition mentioned in Exod. xix. 12, not to touch the mountain, has given rise to the conjecture of a negative reading here. But it is entirely destitute of authority. The prohibition threatens the incautious and wilful offender, showing at the same time that the mountain was a tangible one, and therefore *material*. Thus it is set in contrast with the *spiritual* Mount Zion of ver. 22.—"That burned with fire:" The author no doubt had his mind on the language in Deut. v. 23, "the mountain burned with fire." It is therefore better to translate thus than, with Stuart and others, to render it, 'burning or flaming fire.'—"Sound of a trumpet:" as of a trumpet, the particle of comparison being omitted, as is usual.—With ver. 20 compare Exod. xix. 13.—That the very words of ver. 21 were used by Moses is not stated in the history, but no doubt he felt and probably he expressed the sentiments they contain. The first two occur in the Septuagint of Deut. ix. 19, although the occasion on which they were uttered was different. Most likely the author intends to express in his own

21 θήσεται· καί, οὕτω φοβερὸν ἦν τὸ φανταζόμενον, Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν· ἔκφοβός εἰμι 22 καὶ ἔντρομος· ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει· καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος,

And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart; and 21 so terrible was the sight, *that* Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake:

---

language the awe of the legislator.—" Mount Zion," &c. These are figures to denote Christ's church. " Here, as in Gal. iv. 24, Sinai is the representative of the legal economy, whereas the predictions of the Messiah are connected with Zion, the hill of David. Rom. xi. 26, Rev. xiv. 1, Ps. cxxxii. 13, Isa ii. 3." Tholuck. With " the heavenly Jerusalem," compare Isa. lxii. 1, lxvi. 20, Gal. iv. 26, Rev. xxi. 2. The " above Jerusalem" is a common phrase with the Rabbies to express the happiness of Messiah's kingdom. See quotations in Wetstein on Gal. iv. 26.

" An innumerable company :" literally, myriads. The clauses that follow admit of different modes of punctuation. Some critics put a comma after myriads, which are considered as comprehending the bodies denoted in the two following clauses, thus : 'and to myriads, the general assembly of angels and the church of the first-born who are written in heaven.' Others, putting the same stop after myriads, place a colon or semicolon after the next clause, and thus elicit this sense : ' to myriads, the general assembly of angels ; and to the church,' &c. Stuart expresses himself very strongly in favour of the last punctuation. " So, beyond all reasonable doubt, it is to be pointed ; for *general assembly* is not to be joined with *church*. The structure of the whole paragraph denotes this ; for each separate clause of it, (in vs. 18, 19, 22–24,) is commenced by *and*, and continued where any addition is made to it, by nouns in apposition, without any conjunctive particle between them." Tholuck also prefers this arrangement. He too argues from the use of *and ;* from the terms *general assembly* and *church* being tautological ; and from the word πανηγύρις, (the Greek for the former expression,) which properly denotes a joyous assembly, and is therefore not exactly applicable to the church militant. The two latter reasons are not of much weight. The use of two or more words nearly synonymous to express the same general thought, is not at all uncommon ; and surely, in contrasting the blessed association of Christ's church with the legal terrours, the Apostle might well employ even the strongest expression for a festal assembly. Although this punctuation is perhaps preferable to any other, yet it cannot be questioned that the one generally received is quite admissible. *Myriads* is used in Deut. xxxii. 2, in the Septuagint, in connection with angels, and Κάδης seems to be put there for the Hebrew קדשים, holy ones, saints. Πανηγύρις, expressive of a joyous festival, is used in the same version as a translation of מועד, and ἐκκλησία of קהל. See, for one example of each, Hos. ix. 5, and Deut. xviii. 16.

22 but ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an 23 innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of

Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ, καὶ μυριάσιν, ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρω- 23 τοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων, καὶ πνεύμασι

"First-born" or begotten: The term is several times applied to Christ. See Rom. viii. 29, Col. i. 15, Heb. i. 6. But it does not refer to him here, as is proved by the plural form of the original, and also by the connected clause, "written" or enrolled in heaven. It means the church mystical, which consists of those who really are what they profess to be, that is, saints, and as such are entitled to a part of the sacred privileges of elder sons who have not sold their birthright. There may be an allusion to the 16th verse. The language is illustrated by our Lord's own words, "rejoice that your names are written in heaven." Luke x. 20. Compare also Phil. iv. 3, "whose names are in the book of life;" and Rev. xxi. 27, "written in the lamb's book of life." Hallet suggests that there is an allusion to Num. iii. 40, "Number all *the first-born* of the males, and take the number of their names," which he reasonably supposes were to be inserted in a book. To be written for life and written for death, are Jewish phrases denoting a decision of deliverance and salvation on the one hand, and of condemnation and punishment on the other. See Jude, 4, "before ordained to this condemnation;" literally, 'before *written* for this sentence,' *προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα*. See Wolf's note on Jude.—"God, the judge of all;" that is the ruler, vindicator and protector of all that depend on him. See on x. 30. It implies that all such are under God, their supreme ruler and defender. Thus the Messiah is often represented by the prophets, as the righteous judge or protecting ruler of his people. According to the order of the Greek words, the translation would be, 'and to the judge, (ruler,) the God of all.' But such transpositions are quite common, as is shown by Kuinoel, and the English translation is probably the best; and Bloomfield remarks, that the other would require the article.—"The spirits of just men made perfect." It does not admit of doubt that the Apostle alludes to xi. 39, 40. He refers to the disembodied souls of those holy persons there mentioned and to others of a similar character, whose state of religious knowledge and happiness is complete. The perfection attributed to these departed worthies, with whom true Christians are here said to be associated, is not the ultimate and final perfection in heaven or the union of the soul with its glorified body; but that state of complete enjoyment immediately after death, which St. Paul expresses by the phrase, "to be with Christ." Phil. i. 23. The intelligent reader needs hardly be told that *perfection* is a relative term, and applicable as well to the child as to the grown man; as well to full grown Christians here on earth

24 δικαίων τετελειωμένων, καὶ διαθήκης νέας μεσίτῃ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ αἵματι ῥαντισ-
25 μοῦ, κρεῖττον λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν Ἄβελ. Βλέπετε, μὴ παραιτήσησθε τὸν λαλοῦντα· εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἔφυγον, τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς παραιτησάμενοι χρηματίζοντα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς οἱ τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν
26 ἀποστρεφόμενοι· οὗ ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσε τότε, νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελται λέ-

the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator 24 of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than *that of* Abel. See that ye refuse not him that 25 speaketh: for if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more *shall not* we *escape*, if we turn away from him that *speaketh* from heaven: whose voice 26

---

as to saints in happiness; as well to these happy spirits as to the same spirits on reunion with their glorified bodies; and as well to these as to the most exalted angels. Yet even to the highest archangel it must be applied with suitable limitations. For as in the boundless universe "there is none" positively "good," so there is none absolutely "perfect, but one, that is, God."—"Sprinkling:" figurative for, atoning, as before. Comp. ix. 13, x. 22, and 1 Pet. i. 2.—"Which speaketh better things," (or something better,) "than that of Abel." The singular reading in the Greek has stronger support than the plural, and therefore I have introduced it in the parenthesis. The sense is not altered. Some copies also read the neuter article, παρὰ τὸ Ἄβελ, understanding αἷμα, and making Ἄβελ genitive, thus, 'than the blood of Abel.' The masculine article is probably the best reading. The sense elicited is the same, 'than Abel,' being merely elliptical for the words just given. Such ellipses are by no means uncommon. To give one instance out of many. In Matt. v. 20, we have "*exceed*" for '*exceed the righteousness*' "of the scribes and Pharisees." The neuter reading arose most probably from want of attention to this fact. The comparison is between the blood of Abel figuratively represented as crying for vengeance, and Christ's as pleading for pardon. Some have imagined, that the imperfection of the atonement made by Abel's offering is here contrasted with the superiority of Christ's, which procures and proclaims full pardon. But this is wholly improbable. The author has already exhibited his contrast between the inadequacy of all Jewish sacrifices and the perfection of Christ's. Any farther reference to this point, which had been before settled, would be out of place. It seems impossible to mistake his meaning, if we keep in mind the words of the narrative in Gen. iv. 10, "the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground."

25–27. The remainder of the chapter and the concluding one consist chiefly of practical exhortations, founded on views already presented. Here

then shook the earth, but now he hath promised. saying, Yet once	γων· ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείω οὐ μόνον τὴν

the admonition is enforced by the consideration, that if he who disregarded the law of Moses did not escape punishment, much less shall we if we abandon Christ. The antithetical representation of the respective heads of the two dispensations is very strikingly marked. The one speaks with divine authority, but on earth; the other is from heaven, and speaks as one coming from such a place. The general idea is that of vast superiority in the latter. Thus *earth* and *earthly* are elsewhere employed to denote, not what is merely earthly or worldly in origin, nature, and character, but what, although really good and excellent and even divine, is yet inferior to something else, which, being heavenly or from heaven, is infinitely better. Thus our Lord in the conversation with Nicodemus, contrasts the plainer and less elevated truths of his system with those that are more mysterious and sublime, by designating the one class "earthly" and the other "heavenly." And so the Baptist, with characteristic humility, speaks of himself, his own ecclesiastical and religious character and station and perfection, his comparatively imperfect system, as "of the earth and earthly," in comparison with the person, character, origin, sanctity, and ultimate exaltation of him whose immediate coming he announced. See John iii. 12, 31. The phrase τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν, does not merely mean, as expressed in our English version, "*him that speaketh from heaven*," but, in addition to this, '*him who is from heaven*,' having come from thence. See John iii. 13, vi. 38, 51, 58.—The notion of Hallet, that the speaker on earth is Abel 'represented as still speaking and admonishing mankind,' in contradistinction to God's speaking, needs no refutation.

But, although the contrast between Moses and Christ does evidently seem to be intended in this verse, and if so, Christ will be the person who in the next is said to have shaken the earth at the time of the giving of the law; yet it cannot be denied that "him that speaketh" and "him from heaven" may mean God as speaking to us in the Gospel through Christ and his agents. I cannot but believe, however, that the other view is more in harmony with the contrast, and in analogy with other representations. Some of them are referred to in the note on i. 10–12. If this be allowed, then the author will affirm both the quaking at Mount Sinai and the promise in Haggai to have emanated from the divine Logos, "the angel" who appeared to Moses at the bush as "the God" of his fathers, and sent him to Egypt to deliver his oppressed brethren. If this is not the meaning, then these facts will be affirmed of God. The remark of Tholuck, however, is perfectly true, and also important, "that, in the mind of the author, the reference to God and to Christ must meet together." Hence he rightly infers the impropriety of "pressing a separation of the two references in

27 γῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν. Τὸ δέ, ἔτι ἅπαξ, δηλοῖ τῶν σαλευομένων τὴν μετα-

more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this *word*, Yet 27

---

what follows, where the question whether the speaker from heaven be God or Christ has given rise to so many inquiries."

The quotation from Haggai is imperfect. Indeed, it is more properly a reference to what the prophet says, expressed in a few words borrowed from him, than an accurate quotation. The language of the prophet is as follows: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come; and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts," ii. 6, 7. There are difficulties in the passage. Some of them have no direct connection with the subject here introduced, and shall therefore pass unnoticed. Certain others must be considered. The Apostle evidently contrasts the shaking of the earth at Mount Sinai with a shaking of the heavens: "I shake not only the earth but also heaven." The former is manifestly the literal earth-quaking mentioned in Exodus xix. 18, and elsewhere; but no one, I presume, will therefore infer that the latter is also a literal shaking of the heavens. To refute such an inference would seem to be a work of supererogation. In Haggai the various figurative clauses are explained by the literal clause which immediately follows them, " I will shake all nations." The objects specified, both celestial and terrestrial, are manifestly employed as figures to express all human power, high and low, religious and secular. That heavenly things, as well as earthly, are used in illustration of worldly authorities, is known by every reader of the prophetic Scriptures. See, for a few examples, Isa. xiii. 10, 13, xiv. 12, Ezek. xxxii. 7, 8, Joel ii. 10. It has been supposed by some that, in the prophet, " the heavens" stand for the Jewish polity, inasmuch as it was of divine origin; and hence it has been inferred that the prophet predicts the overthrow of that polity, and the permanent establishment of one better and more enduring. No doubt he does make this prediction; but this cannot be inferred on such grounds. Several reasons might be alleged against such a supposition, but one must here suffice. If this particular clause in the prophet's declaration is directly referable to the heavenly established Jewish polity, consistency requires that the other clauses also should have their specific meanings; and then it will not be easy to say what " the earth, the sea, and the dry land" stand for. It is much more reasonable and in accordance with the analogy of scriptural language, to suppose that the prophet's distinct specifications are merely indicative of the vastness of the predicted shaking, including, it may be, the extraordinary elevation of spiritual tyranny and control exercised by some of the powers referred to. Comp. " high," Eph. vi. 12, in the Greek. Thus he will express in other terms, the very same thing that Ezekiel foretold in the

once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as

θεσιν, ὡς πεποιημένων, ἵνα μείνῃ τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα. Διὸ βασιλείαν ἀσάλευ- 28

---

words, "I will overturn, and overturn, overturn it, until he come whose right it is," xxi. 27, (Heb. 32.) That is, I will subvert various human kingdoms and authorities, in order to prepare the way for the coming of him, whose kingdom, like his rightful authority, shall be everlasting. In this view, the Apostle seems, in the ardour of his mind, to seize upon the prophet's thought. He does not dwell on the language, he cares not for the words; it is the magnitude of the thing that engrosses his attention. Formerly God, or in him the divine Logos, shook the earth at the announcement of the law, thus giving a terrific indication of its nature; but, in reference to something incomparably greater, he hath promised by his prophet to shake, and to make totter and fall, every power, civil and religious, both antagonistic and simply inferior and introductory, in order to prepare the way for that final establishment of his own kingdom, which shall not only never be overthrown, but never shaken from its solid and immoveable foundation.

"But now," is regarded by Kuinoel and others as designating time, and explained thus: "but as respects the times of the New Testament." This seems very probable, from the evident antithesis with "then" which immediately precedes. Otherwise the particle might be comprehended among those quoted on viii. 6. Indeed, it is not unlikely, that the same shade of thought which I have there stated may also be intended here.

The prophet commences his prediction in the terms "yet once." The Apostle, in explaining the meaning, employs this commencing word of the prophet: "Now this, yet once." Our English translation has introduced the term *word*, for which there is nothing equivalent in the Greek or Hebrew. It is not only unnecessary, but injurious, as it mars the sense. The *phrase* "yet once" cannot be shown to signify what the Apostle immediately proceeds to state. It is indeed, as Tholuck remarks, "serviceable to the writer's purpose," because it intimates that one great concussion of temporary powers introductory to the establishment of the Gospel should take place, in contradistinction to that literal concussion of earthly elements which accompanied the giving of the law. Still if we allow that, in this view, the expression *yet once* is emphatic, the expression may stand in place of the whole passage, according to a usual Rabbinical method of quoting. Tholuck objects, that "the fact of the prophetic declaration so immediately preceding goes against" this view. I am at a loss to see the force of this remark. We have the same kind of representation in Eph. iv. 9: 'But this, he ascended, τὸ δὲ, ἀνέβη, what is it,' &c. The method of quotation or rather of reference to portions of Scripture presumed to be in the mind of the reader, is of frequent occurrence in the

τον παραλαμβάνοντες ἔχωμεν χάριν, δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ, μετὰ

of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a 28

---

works of the Rabbies; and it strongly illustrates their thorough verbal acquaintance at least with the Hebrew Scriptures. I will give one remarkable instance from the Commentary of Aben Ezra on Zech. iii. 2, "is not this a brand plucked from the burning." The Hebrew for *is not* is *halo*, and it stands at the beginning of the clause. The words of the commentator are these: "And the sense of halo is allegorical;" meaning, the whole clause is so, which the reader will perceive to be the case. Other similar instances may be seen in the Jewish Rabbies, p. 140, note. In the same way the author of the epistle cites the first words of the prophet as suggestive of his whole meaning. It is as if he had said, the prediction implies the unsteady and mutable character of earthly establishments, which are to be shaken and fall, in order that something better, which is to be substituted in their place, shall be unmoved.—"As things made:" meaning as ordinary objects of creation, adapted to the present and transitory state. The expression seems here to be equivalent to "things made with hands," which denotes imperfection. See Acts vii. 48, Eph. ii. 11, and compare the note on "Not made with hands," in Heb. ix. 11.—"Might remain:" Precisely in this way and with the use of the same word does the Apostle contrast the dispensations of the law and the Gospel in 2 Cor. iii. 11: "If that which was done away was glorious, much more *that which remaineth* is glorious."

28, 29. "Receiving a kingdom." Comp. Dan. viii. 18, "the saints of the Most High shall *take* the kingdom;" where, in the Greek translation, the word is the same as that here employed. "The expression implies a participation in the royal dignity, the reigning with Christ, 1 Pet. ii. 9, Rev. i. 6, v. 10." Tholuck.—"Cannot be moved:" The Greek word is of the same root as those before used, and it is unfortunate that our translators should have chosen another term. "Cannot be shaken," which is the Geneva rendering, would most directly have kept the reader's mind to the all-important contrast. Such inadequate translations occur elsewhere in our English Bible. It may be well to cite a few illustrations. In John vi. 27, '*labour*' is followed in the next verses by *work*, although both the Greek and the subject are the same as before. And in xv. 9, 10, we have *continue ye* in my love, followed by *abide* twice, the original being the same in each case. To these may be added 1 John i. 2, 3, when the same Greek word is translated by *show* and *declare;* ii. 24, where the one verb is rendered *abide*, *remain*, and *continue;* v. 6–11, when we have *witness*, *record*, *testified*, repeatedly interchanged as translations of the one word, and the same verb rendered *gave*. And in vs. 14. 15, after *ask* twice we have the same original word

kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence 29 and godly fear: for our God *is* a consuming fire.

XIII. Let brotherly love continue.

αἰδοῦς καὶ εὐλαβείας· καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς 29 ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον.

Ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέτω. Τῆς φιλο- XIII.

---

expressed by *desired.* In 2 Pet. ii. 1, 2, the Greek ἀπωλεία is first translated *damnable*, then *destruction*, and lastly *pernicious.* The second term or its adjective would have fitly expressed the meaning in each case. In the same epistle, ii. 10, we have in the adjective or participial form the Greek word for *blaspheme*, *speak evil of*, *rail at*, which is translated by the two latter phrases, whereas the unvarying use of the last would have given the English reader a more accurate representation of the original. To these instances I will add another from the 40th Psalm, which is particularly important as it bears on its true interpretation. In ver. 9, we have the word *refrained* and in ver. 11 *withhold.* The Hebrew word is the same in each case, and this affords an almost irresistible presumption that the speaker is in both places the same. See above, p. 142.—"Let us have grace:" This may mean, according to a usual sense of the Greek phrase, 'let us thank.' Comp. 1 Tim. i. 12, 2 Tim. i. 3. But this meaning is not probable; for the object to whom thanks are to be offered is not stated, and the following words "by which," would have no intelligible antecedent. Neither is it in harmony with the connected clause, "we may serve God acceptably." The more probable meaning is, 'let us hold, keep, retain grace;' either the Gospel, as the word is used in Tit. ii. 11, and elsewhere, or the spiritual influence thereby attained, namely, divine favour. Ἔχω is used in this sense in 2 Tim. i. 13, and probably 1 Tim. iii. 9. In the former case the noun connected with it, as χάριν here, is without the article. The "doubt" therefore, which is expressed by Professor Stuart of its being "necessary to support" such an "interpretation," is unfounded.

29. The force of the καί, which does not appear in our translation, seems to be this: 'for even our God,' &c. The connection may be with the "reverence and godly fear" just expressed; or with the exhortation to adhere to the grace of the Gospel, lest its beneficent giver should take fiery vengeance on apostates.

xiii. 2. "Unawares:" The Greek ἔλαθον is used here adverbially, as appears in our translation. This is an idiom of the language, and it occurs also in John vi. 21, where ἤθελον expresses the idea of "willingly."—The facts alluded to are no doubt such as are mentioned in Gen. xviii. and xix. The author does not intimate that his readers might expect to entertain such celestial beings; but urges the duty of hospitality, in consideration of the honour which had been conferred on its exercise in the case of certain dis-

ξενίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε· διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες ἀγγέλους. 3 Μιμνήσκεσθε τῶν δεσμίων, ὡς συνδεδεμένοι· τῶν κακουχουμένων, ὡς καὶ 4 αὐτοὶ ὄντες ἐν σώματι. Τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος· πόρνους 5 δὲ καὶ μοιχοὺς κρινεῖ ὁ θεός. Ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος, ἀρκούμενοι τοῖς παροῦσιν· αὐτὸς γὰρ εἴρηκεν, οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ, 6 οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω· ὥστε θαῤῥοῦντας ἡμᾶς λέγειν, κύριος ἐμοὶ βοηθός, καὶ οὐ φοβηθήσομαι τί ποιήσει μοι 7 ἄνθρωπος. Μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὧν ἀναθεωροῦντες τὴν

2 Be not forgetful to entertain strangers; for thereby some have entertained angels unawares. 3 Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; *and* them which suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body. 4 Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge. 5 *Let your* conversation *be* without covetousness, *and be* content with such things as ye have; for he hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee. 6 So that we may boldly say, The Lord *is* my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me. 7 Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you

---

tinguished persons, who had practised it. From Matt. xxv. 44, 45, it appears that the Lord himself is entertained in the person of the needy guest who belongs to him.

3. "As bound:" referring to the sympathy of true Christians with each other.—"As being in the body:" and therefore subject to similar evils.

4. This may either be declarative, as in our translation, or hortatory, 'let marriage,' &c.—"Judge:" that is condemn, punish, κρίνω for κατακρίνω, as is frequent.

5. Comp. Deut. xxxi. 6, 1 Chron. xxviii. 20.

6. Comp. Ps. cxviii. 6. Some commentators regard the last words as interrogative, thus: "I will not fear. What will man do to me?" The usual connection is quite as good; and therefore I have adapted Hahn's punctuation to it.

7. It seems probable, although it is by no means certain, that those whom the Apostle exhorts the Hebrews to remember, were dead, yet some of them, at least, may have been still living elsewhere. "The end of their conversation" or conduct may be their death, more probably perhaps, the happy result of their Christian course.

8. This is a distinct sentence, in which the substantive verb is understood. It is often read as if in grammatical construction with the preceding verse, and Jesus Christ were "the end" there mentioned. But the different cases of the two words in the Greek show that this is a mistake. The Apostle asserts Christ to be eternal and immutable, implying also the perpetuity and unchangeableness of his system. Comp. the language in Ps. cii. 27.

9. The common reading is περιφέρεσθε, be carried (or whirled) about;

the word of God: whose faith follow, considering the end of *their* 8 conversation. Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever. 9 Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines; for *it is* a good thing that the heart be established with grace, not with meats, which have not profited them that 10 have been occupied therein. We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tab-

ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς μιμεῖσθε τὴν πίστιν. Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς χθὲς καὶ σήμερον 8 *ὁ αὐτός, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Διδαχαῖς* 9 *ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε· καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν, οὐ βρώμασιν, ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατήσαντες. Ἔχομεν θυσι-* 10 *αστήριον, ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξ-*

---

but the best critics prefer *παραφέρεσθε*, be carried along, or aside. Either sense is in itself very good, and directly connected with the preceding verse.

10. The Apostle here excludes from any right to Christian privileges those who depend upon the abrogated Jewish ritual.—"Serve the tabernacle:" Compare viii. 5, "serve the pattern and shadow," which conveys the same meaning. Such determined adherence to the sacrifices and ritual observances which the Messiah's "one oblation of himself once offered" had "caused to cease," (see Dan. ix. 27,) was no less than a wilful rejection of the truth. Such persons can "have no right to eat of our altar." And, although the language relates immediately to the votaries of an exploded Jewish system of outward observances, yet the principle implied is general, and the truth here taught is, that there can be no right to the blessings of the Gospel in those who rest on any services of their own, especially external, as the ground of their claim. It must be obvious to any intelligent reader, that the phraseology is drawn from Jewish usage. "Altar" is figurative for all the benefits connected with and dependent on it. It necessarily suggests and comprehends the ideas of sacrifice, priest, temple, atonement, propitiation, satisfaction, intercession, acceptance, favour, benediction, happiness and glory. To limit it to any one institution of the Gospel system is frigid, and not in harmony with the context. It implies a partaking of our own Christian sacrifice, that is, Christ; and this brings along with it all spiritual blessings. Many explain it as a metonomy, and consider the altar as put for the sacrifice, referring to 1 Cor. x. 18. But even there the thing eaten is the *sacrifice*, and those who eat partake of it in common with the altar, which consumed the part that was placed thereon, while the offerer consumed another part. The Apostle cannot there employ the word altar for sacrifice; for it would be a mere truism to say, 'they that eat of the sacrifices partake of the altar,' that is, the sacrifice. He personifies the altar, and makes both it and the worshippers joint partakers. It gives a fuller sense of the passage before us to regard it as a synecdoche, representing the whole of spiritual blessings. Certainly the

11 ουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες. Ὧν γὰρ εἰσφέρεται ζώων τὸ αἷμα περὶ ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὰ ἅγια διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, τούτων τὰ σώματα κατακαίεται ἔξω τῆς
12 παρεμβολῆς. Διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα ἁγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν λαόν, ἔξω

ernacle. For the bodies of those 11 beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high-priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might 12 sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.

Christian privileges expressed by the figures flow from the sacrifice of Christ, who is here especially referred to.

The word altar in this verse has often been interpreted of the Lord's table, and the Apostle has been thought to refer particularly to the holy supper. But two considerations are opposed to this view. It is too limited. No one Christian institution, however sacred and important, can meet the general requisition of the context. Neither is the word altar ever so used in the New Testament. St. Paul employs the phrase "the table of the Lord," in 1 Cor. x. 21, and we have no scriptural evidence that any other was in use. It were idle to dwell a moment on Matt. v. 23, 24, as the word "altar" there refers, beyond all doubt, to the Jewish. Parkhurst in his Lexicon, Suicer in his Thesaurus, and Tholuck on the text in Hebrews, suppose a reference to the Lord's table, and also that the original term is employed by Ignatius in the same sense. The four places of Ignatius in which the word occurs are adduced and examined briefly in my Essay on our Lord's Discourse at Capernaum, to which I must refer the reader.* Only one can with any plausibility be said to bear such a sense, and even that *admits very naturally* the same interpretation, namely, the church, which the other three *demand*. In Tertullian and Irenæus, *altar* is occasionally employed in this sense, and by subsequent writers frequently; though *table* and *holy table* and *mystical table* were also in use.

It may be well to state the views of the word altar in this verse, as given by some of the leading commentators both of ancient and modern times. The best of the Greek fathers explain it figuratively. Thus Theodoret, in his note on the place: "This is much more precious than the old, for that was a shadow of this. That receives the irrational sacrifices, but this that which is rational and divine."† And Chrysostom: "For see, we have above the victim, above the priest, above the sacrifice. Let us, therefore, offer such sacrifices as can be offered on such an altar. No more sheep and oxen; no more blood and odour of burned fat. All these are abolished, and in their place is substituted a rational worship."‡ He then proceeds to describe this worship as spiritual, consisting in modesty, temperance, almsgiving, and other virtues. Also, Cyril of Alexandria: "He, therefore, is the altar, and he the receiver and high-priest, he also

* pp. 110–113. † Opera, Tom. iii. p. 460. ‡ Opera, Bened. Edit. Tom. xiii. p. 114.

13 Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his re-
14 proach: for here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to
15 come. By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of *our*

τῆς πύλης ἔπαθε. Τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα 13 *πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες· οὐ γάρ ἔχο-* 14 *μεν ὧδε μένουσαν πόλιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν. Δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν* 15 *ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως διαπαντὸς*

---

the blood of purification from sins."* Theophylact probably understood the word of the Lord's table: The author of the epistle, "after remarking that meats are not to be regarded, says, that we also have what should be regarded, not indeed in such meats, but in the altar of the unbloody sacrifice of the quickening body."† The language of Cyril appears to contain the fullest meaning. As if the Apostle had said, all the blessings of the Gospel meet in Christ. To speak of the altar is to speak of the sacrifice, of the temple, and of every benefit connected with and flowing from them. Cardinal Hugo in loc: "We have an altar, Christ or faith in Christ on whom (in quo) our prayers and works are offered to God for acceptance." Yet he evidently has the eucharist in view, for soon after he says of those who have not the right or power (potestas) of eating, "they are not worthy of the communion of the body and blood of Christ." Still it is equally evident from what follows that he does not mean to explain the word *altar* here of communion table: "We have an altar, that is, the cross of the Lord or the memory of his passion, (crucem Domini vel memoriam suæ passionis;) on which altar we should offer the natural motions of the flesh by discipline, (animales motus carnis per macerationem.) To the same purpose Nicolas de Lyra,‡ although he is very brief: "We have an altar, that is, the cross on which (Christ) was offered."

Coming down to the more modern expositors of any note, we find in general the same interpretation. In the Critici Sacri, the word *altar* is passed over without notice by Valla, Revius, Erasmus, Vatablus, Castalio, Zeger, Lucas Brugensis, H. Stephens, Drusius, Casaubon, Cameron, and Louis Capel; twelve distinguished commentators, who appear to have thought the clause so plain as to need no elucidation. And so it would really seem to be, had not men's minds been led astray by a word, to which their own inclination or education had attached a meaning which in holy Scripture it never bears. Of the other three commentators comprised in the same work, not one refers the term to the eucharistic table. Clarius explains it of the cross on which Christ, as on an altar, was offered; and so also James Capel; Grotius of Christian privileges.

* De Adoratione, Lib. ix. Opera, Lutet. 1638. Tom. i. p. 310. † Opera, vol. ii. p. 758.
‡ Postilla, in four folio volumes, printed at Nuremberg in 1493.

τῷ θεῷ, τοῦτ' ἔστι καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμο-
16 λογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. Τῆς δὲ εὐ-
ποιΐας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε·
17 τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ
θεός. Πείθεσθε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν καὶ

lips, giving thanks to his name.
But to do good and to communicate, 16
forget not; for with such sacrifices
God is well pleased. Obey them 17
that have the rule over you, and

Poole explains it of Christ; Whitby of Christ's "body offered and broken on the cross, by partaking of the memorials of which we testify our communion with Christ and his church;" Hammond of "Christ the only Christian altar;" Owen and Guise of Christ; Lightfoot of Christ, with marked disapprobation of communion table; Burkett of "Christ alone and his sacrifice;" Doddridge of Christ and his sacrifice on the cross; Dodd of the "sacrifice of Christ;" Adam Clark of the "sacrifice, which is Jesus Christ;" Scott of "atonement by Christ;" Valpy and Bloomfield of "sacrifice." Hallet says, "an altar, namely the cross of Christ;" so also Barnes; Macknight, "the altar is put for the sacrifice of himself which Christ offered to God, and the eating means the partaking of the pardon procured by that sacrifice;" McLean, "altar is here put for the sacrifice offered upon it." Beza also explains it of "Christ, our oblation;" Wolf of Christ and his sacrifice on the cross; Calov of "the victim which is Christ." Estius, according to Owen, vol. vii., p. 462, does himself explain it of Christ, but, inasmuch as some fathers regarded it as referable to the Lord's table, he thinks it may be employed in argument thereto. Fulke explains it of Christ, in opposition to the Rhemish note. The Rheims and Douay annotator speaks very vaguely, as if Christ were offered, "first on the cross, secondly, in the eucharist, and thirdly, in heaven;" and says that "altar is not used for the oblation itself." The note impresses the conviction, that the writer either had no clear thought, or was reluctant to express it clearly. John David Michaelis* thinks that the author of the epistle does not mean by the word altar, either Christ, or the cross, or Golgotha, or the Gospel, or the Communion table. He regards it as a figurative expression of the thought, that such persons have no right to eat of our Christian offerings, as the Levitical priests had no right to partake of those sacrifices of the highest grade, whose blood was brought by the high-priest into the most holy place. "To eat of the Christian altar is equivalent to being fully supplied with grace (sich mit Gnade sættigen,) as expressed in ver. 9. Kuinoel agrees with the leading commentators: "We are able to enjoy those benefits which the salutary death of Christ affords." Thus also Peile. He remarks in the text: "Altar is put by a metonymy for the victim upon it, as though the Apostle had said, we Christians have our sacrifice, the body and blood, namely of Christ, prefigured in the paschal and symbolized in the Lord's supper." And in a note he says, "the

* Erklaerung, p. 398.

submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account; that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for	ὑπείκετε· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες· ἵνα μετὰ χαρᾶς τοῦτο ποιῶσι, καὶ μὴ στενάζοντες· ἀλυσιτελὲς γὰρ ὑμῖν τοῦ-

Christian altar, which is Christ himself." Not one of these writers ventures to interpret *altar* here simply and clearly of the Lord's table, and very few even allude to such a sense.

11–13. An analogy is here traced between the action on the day of atonement and that of Christ. The body of the victim, whose blood the high-priest had sprinkled in the most holy place, was burned without the camp. See Levit. xvi. 27. And so Jesus made the propitiatory offering of himself without the precincts of the city. This analogy is then practically applied in an exhortation to abandon Judaism and every such imperfect system, by believing on and adhering to Christ, notwithstanding the reproach and persecution which may follow.—The word "camp," which at first is literal, has afterwards a figurative signification. A similar change of the meaning of a word occurs in 1 Thess. v. 5–7, where "sleep" is used in different senses.—"His reproach:" that is, such as he endured. See on xi. 26.

15. "The fruit of the lips:" that is, oral and open expressions of thanksgiving, as in Prov. xviii. 20, "the fruit of the mouth," means what is uttered thereby. The language is taken from the Septuagint of Isa. lvii. 19, or Hos. xiv. 2, probably the latter. Here the Hebrew has "calves," meaning perhaps such sacrifices as the lips had promised, or expressions of thanksgiving more acceptable to God than sacrifices. The Septuagint translation in Hosea may be obtained from the Hebrew by the substitution of one letter for another very similar, a *pe* for a *beth*.

17. Proper attention and obedience to spiritual guides is here inculcated. Of civil rulers it would not be said, "they watch for your souls," &c. It is doubtful whether the clause, "that they may do it with joy and not grieving," refers to the watching or the giving an account. Either application makes a good sense. The latter seems quite in accordance with the words in Acts xx. 24, "that I may finish my course with joy," if the last two words there are genuine; also with Phil. iv. 1, which ought to be understood in connection with the verses immediately preceding; and also with 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20. Still, it cannot be questioned that the *watching* is, as Kuinoel remarks, the leading thought, and to this he supposes that the clause relates. Perhaps both applications may be combined.

18. "A good conscience:" This language reminds one of St. Paul's as elsewhere used. It is certainly in exact harmony with that habitually employed by this Apostle. Compare Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16, Rom. ix. 1, 2 Cor. i. 12, 2 Tim. i. 3.

18 το. Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν· πεποίθαμεν γάρ, ὅτι καλὴν συνείδησιν ἔχομεν, ἐν πᾶσι καλῶς θέλοντες ἀναστρέ-
19 φεσθαι· περισσοτέρως δὲ παρακαλῶ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν.
20 Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου,
21 τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ, εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ

that *is* unprofitable for you. Pray 18 for us: for we trust we have a good conscience, in all things willing to live honestly. But I beseech 19 *you* the rather to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner.

Now the God of peace, that 20 brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you per- 21 fect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is

---

20, 21. "Peace:" that is, blessing, according to common usage.—"Through" or with "the blood." Commentators differ respecting the connection of these words. Some join them with those immediately preceding, supposing the meaning to be, that in consequence of the shedding of his blood he is the great shepherd, &c. Others connect them with the first words of the next verse, and deduce this view: 'through the blood of the everlasting covenant make you perfect.' It is probably best to connect them with "brought up from the dead;" but not with the meaning which Prof. Stuart thinks proper to state and refute.* "With the blood," *ἐν αἵματι·* (Compare ix. 22.) The idea seems to be the same as that of ix. 12, though the preposition there used is *διά*. But either is allowable. The true signification is probably as follows: 'The God of blessing, who raised Jesus from the dead with that atoning blood of his, (meaning the satisfaction and merit of his own sacrifice,) which procures and ratifies a covenant the happy effects of which are everlasting,' &c.—The doxology which terminates the next verse is intended of Christ. Compare Rom. ix. 5.

22. "Exhortation:" Better probably, as the original word also means, address. Thus it is used in Acts xiii. 15, and the words here following show that the author refers to the epistle in general. He speaks of it as short, in consideration of the magnitude and importance of the topics discussed. On the other hand, St. Paul characterizes his letter to the Galatians, which is not half the size of this, as long, (vi. 11,) in reference to its having been written by himself and not by an amanuensis. The terms are of course relative, and must be so explained.

23. *Ἀπολελυμένον·* The word bears the sense of our English translation, "set at liberty," or, 'sent away.' Stuart and Peile understand it in the latter meaning, and hence derive an argument in favour of St. Paul

* "What can be the sense of raising Christ from the dead by the blood of the everlasting covenant? Almighty power raised him from the dead, not the blood of the covenant." This is hardly worthy of such a commentator.

well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen.

22 And I beseech you, brethren, suffer the word of exhortation: for I have written a letter unto you

23 in few words. Know ye that *our* brother Timothy is set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I

24 will see you. Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you.

25 Grace *be* with you all. Amen.

Written to the Hebrews from Italy by Timothy.

Χριστοῦ· ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν.

Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἀνέχεσθε τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως· καὶ γὰρ διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν. 22 *Γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον, μεθ' οὗ, ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται, ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς.* 23 *Ἀσπάσασθε πάντας τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους. Ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας.* 24 *Ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. ἀμήν.* 25

Πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ τῆς Ιταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου.

---

being the author. Tholuck, on the contrary, defends the former, and therefore does not regard it as affording evidence for that authorship. The reader must form his own judgment on the respective weight of the arguments, by examining the writers themselves. Stuart, Introduction, § 19, p. 120–127, Commentary, second edition, Andover, 1833; Tholuck, Introduction, chap. 1, § 2, A. p. 20–23, Commentary, Hamilton's Translation, in the Biblical Cabinet, Edinburgh, vol. xxxviii., 1842. It appears to me that they do not afford sufficient grounds for a positive decision on either side.

24. *Οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας·* Either 'they who are here from Italy;' or, 'they who are of Italy,' that is, 'the Italian Christians.' The Greek allows either meaning. The latter is undoubtedly the more probable. Tholuck, who admits that the Greek fairly bears this signification, prefers the other on the ground, that if the epistle were written from Rome, "we should expect the expression to have been, they of Rome." This is not at all conclusive. Certainly it might be so, but surely the author of the letter may have had communication with Italian Christians out of Rome, and have joined them with their Roman brethren in the salutation.

THE END.

WORKS

BY

SAMUEL H. TURNER, D.D.

A Companion to the Book of Genesis.

"Though not designed to be a commentary, this valuable, but in this country little known work, furnishes the Biblical student with abundant aid for the exact and literal interpretation of the book of Genesis."—*Horne's Introduction.*

Biographical Notices

OF SOME OF THE MOST DISTINGUISHED JEWISH RABBIES, AND Translations of portions of their Commentaries, and other works, with illustrative Introductions and Notes.

"We have here another interesting and instructive work from the able and learned author. The appearance of the volume at this time must give fresh interest to the efforts now making in behalf of the Jews. Every Christian wishes to see them embrace Jesus Christ as their long-promised Messiah, and the pious labours of the Church for that object can be directed with more intelligence and effect, when we are brought into a better acquaintance with the views entertained by their Rabbies, respecting the prophecies which foretell the Saviour's advent. Their opinions are here presented to us by Dr. Turner in his own clear and chaste style of writing, and will be read with instruction by those whose 'heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they may be saved.'"—*New York Express.*

Spiritual Things compared with Spiritual,

AND EXPLAINED TO SPIRITUAL MEN; OR, AN ATTEMPT TO IL-lustrate the New Testament by Parallel References.

"This collection of references was originally compiled for the use of theological students. It may be made more extensively useful by aiding teachers in Sunday Schools and Bible Classes, and by being carefully studied by readers of the Scriptures generally."—*Miscellany.*

Discourses.

THOUGHTS ON THE ORIGIN, CHARACTER, AND INTERPRETATION of Scripture Prophecy, in Seven Discourses, delivered in the Chapel of the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church. With Notes. Published at the request of the students.

SERMONS.

Melvill, Henry.

SERMONS BY HENRY MELVILL, COMPRISING ALL THE DISCOURSES published by consent of the Author. Edited by the Rt. Rev. Charles P. M'Ilvaine, D.D., Bishop of the Prot. Epis. Church in the Diocese of Ohio. Two large octavo volumes. Ninth Thousand. $3.50.

"Melvill is no ordinary man, and produces no ordinary influence. Possessing a brilliant imagination, having great command of words, and being full of the fire of genius, he sways the hearts of crowded congregations who listen to the living voice, and of multitudes who peruse the productions of his glowing pen. It is impossible to read Melvill's Sermons and not be gratified, and what is better, improved. There is so much of the earnestness and affectionateness of the "man of God," so much zeal for the truth as it is in Jesus, so great acuteness, and so happy a faculty of illustrating and enforcing Scriptural truth, that involuntarily one pays the highest tribute which an author can receive, in forgetting him and fastening the mind upon the ennobling subjects of his labours. The present edition is especially valuable, since here we have the discourses of the gifted author as he wrote them and committed them to the press, and the publishers have taken pains to include in the present issue, both the parochial sermons, and those delivered on public occasions and before the University of Cambridge; by which we have here the contents of some five or six volumes of the English edition, at a price which brings them within the reach of all. The mechanical execution is in the publishers' usual style of excellence."—*Miscellany.*

Manning, Henry Edward, M. A.

SERMONS BY HENRY EDWARD MANNING, M.A., ARCHDEACON OF Chichester. Three large octavo volumes. $3.75.

"Apart from a few expressions, which have to do with his own church organization, they are such as all Christians, of whatever persuasion, would be well satisfied to read; and not only satisfied but edified."—*Intelligencer.*

"Manning possesses a mind of peculiar richness and vigour, clothed upon with all the glorious truths of our holy religion. He delineates most beautifully the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus; and is always most eloquent when nearest to the Cross. His style, peculiarly his own, cannot be commended to any divine; for, apart from its many objectionable features, it could not be successfully imitated: but the expository character of his sermons is of the first order; and here Manning may be studied with the greatest advantage. His sermons are from his text, made up of its elements, not introducing his subject, but suggesting and containing it. Therefore they are always a faithful exposition of the text. The present edition of his sermons cannot fail to have a wide and justly deserved circulation."—*Spectator.*

Castleman, Rev. T. T.

PLAIN SERMONS FOR SERVANTS. BY REV. T. T. CASTLEMAN, Rector of Trinity Church, Staunton, Va., and other Ministers of the Episcopal Church. Written and published by request of the Rt. Rev. William Meade, D.D. and the Convocation of Central Virginia. 1 vol. 12mo. $1.00.

Horsley, Samuel, LL. D., F. R. S., F. A. S.

SERMONS BY SAMUEL HORSLEY, LL.D., F.R.S., F.A.S., LATE LORD Bishop of St. Asaph. 1 vol. 8vo. $1.50.

Rox, Fev. George Townshend, M. A.

TEN SERMONS, WITH A PREFATORY LETTER, ADDRESSED TO THE Rt. Rev. Bishop M'Ilvaine, by Rev. George Townshend Fox, M. A., of Durham. 1 vol. 8vo. $1.00.

REV. CHARLES B. TAYLER'S WORKS.

Mark Wilton, the Merchant's Clerk.

Mr. Tayler has written many admirable works, but none better calculated to do good than the one before us. In the character of Mark Wilton we behold the young man of weak moral principle, easily seduced into temptation and sin; his whole life presenting varying changes from evil to good, from sin to penitence; and in the character of his fellow clerk, one firm in Christian principle, and proof against the fascinating allurements and wholesale temptations of the world. It should be read by every clerk in our great cities.

Scenes in a Clergyman's Life.

The reputation of this work has been so firmly established, that it has run through many editions both in England and America.

Lady Mary; or, Not of the World.

The design of this work is to delineate religious character as presented in the upper walks of life in England.

Margaret; or, The Pearl.

"The name of Margaret has two meanings: in Greek, it is a pearl; in French, it is the most modest and the most common of flowers, the daisy, springing up wherever a little patch of greensward refreshes the gaze with its soft and beautiful colour. In my simple story of 'Margaret,' the reader may find me employing my leisure with this flower, endeavouring at the same time to keep before them and myself, the One Pearl of great price, after whom I have purposely named my Margaret."—*Extract from Preface.*

Thankfulness:

A NARRATIVE COMPRISING PASSAGES FROM THE DIARY OF THE Rev. Allan Temple.

This is an exceedingly interesting work, in the form of fiction conveying religious lessons. The passages in the life of the young clergyman present beautiful pictures of the trials and rewards of ministerial labours, while there is sufficient of a tale in the narrative to attract the attention of any reader. The author has already won a high reputation for his writings of this kind, and the present work will add to it.

Earnestness;

OR, INCIDENTS IN THE LIFE OF AN ENGLISH BISHOP.

This work, although intended as a sequel to "Thankfulness," has its distinctive character. It is a beautiful exhibition of the Episcopal character, with some of its attending difficulties in the English Church.

Angels' Song.

This is the eighth of these exquisitely conceived and impressively written works which, emanating from the pen of this pure and charming writer, and having had a wide and useful circulation in England, the enterprising publishers at 137 Broadway have produced in this country; an act for which they have received the warmest thanks of some of the best and most judicious of the land. Excellent and admirable as are the previous volumes of Mr. Tayler, this by many will be preferred, it being more domestic in its teaching and in the incidents which form its charm and attraction. It is most beautifully written, and the narrative or family history one that cannot fail to make a deep impression upon the reader. "The Angels' Song" is peculiarly fitted to cheer and animate the Christian; and happy, thrice happy, the man who can say, "I have at last learnt 'The Angels' Song.'"

Records of a Good Man's Life.

"Of Mr. Tayler's work, 'Records of a Good Man's Life,' we retain, after a lapse of many years, a fresh and delightful recollection."—*Evergreen.*

Christmass at Old Court: a Fire-side Book.

"The perusal of this work has afforded us great pleasure. It cannot be read by any one without making them both wiser and better."—*Spectator.*

May You Like It.

"This charming book has passed through six editions in England, and we confidently predict its welcome reception by the American public."—*Journal.*

LORD'S SUPPER.

Bickersteth.

TREATISE ON THE LORD'S SUPPER, DESIGNED AS A GUIDE AND Companion to the Holy Communion. By the Rev. Edward Bickersteth. Edited and adapted to the Services of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States by the Rev. Lewis P. W. Balch, Rector of St. Bartholomew's Church, New York. 12mo. 75 cents.

It is indeed a cause of devout thankfulness that books like "Bickersteth's Treatise on the Lord's Supper" are in such demand. And a fervent prayer is offered to God, that every effort to enlighten the hearts of men on the subject of the Holy Communion, may receive His gracious blessing, until the time come when all "shall be devoutly and religiously disposed to receive the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, in remembrance of His meritorious death and Passion, whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven."

THE DEVOUT COMMUNICANT, BEING THOSE PARTS OF A TREATISE on the Lord's Supper, which are suited to assist the Devotions of the Communicant. By the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, Minister of Wheler Chapel. 32mo. 38 cents.

Christians have long found the advantage of small practical works to assist their devotions in preparing for the Lord's Supper, while attending at His table, and on returning from it. To meet the wishes of several friends, the author has taken from his larger Treatise those parts which are suited for this purpose. He has also published, at a small price, an abridgment of those parts which relate to the doctrines and duties of the Holy Communion, under the title of "An Invitation to the Lord's Supper," in the hope of exciting more attention to this most edifying and comforting ordinance.

Hobart.

COMMUNICANT'S MANUAL: CONTAINING THE ORDER FOR THE Administration of the Holy Communion. By the late John Henry Hobart, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New York. To which are added, appropriate Selections from the Works of Bishops Taylor, Beveridge, &c., &c. 32mo. 25 cents.

This little work is taken from the larger work of the late lamented Bishop Hobart, on the same subject. It contains the order for the administration of the Holy Eucharist, with meditations and prayers, in a compass convenient for use at the time of the celebration of the communion, and will be found a most desirable companion to the pious and devout Communicant.

A COMPANION FOR THE ALTAR, OR, WEEK'S PREPARATION FOR the Holy Communion: consisting of a Short Explanation of the Lord's Supper, and Meditations and Prayers proper to be used before and during the receiving of the Holy Communion; according to the Form prescribed by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. By John Henry Hobart, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York. 12mo. 50 cents.

This work is too well known to the members of the Church to require any notice of its great merits. The subjoined extract from the Preface will give a most correct idea of the plan of the author. "The writer has endeavoured to keep in view two principles, which he deems most important and fundamental. These principles are—That we are saved from the guilt and dominion of sin by the divine unity and grace of a crucified Redeemer: and that the merits and grace of this Redeemer are applied to the soul of the believer in the devout and humble participation of the ordinances of the Church, administered by a priesthood who derive their authority by regular transmission from Christ, the Divine Head of the Church, and the source of all power in it."

FAMILY AND PRIVATE DEVOTIONS.

Andrewes.

THE DEVOTIONS OF BISHOP ANDREWES, TRANSLATED FROM THE Greek, and arranged anew. 18mo. 50 cents.

The forms of Devotions in this work not being fully drawn out, but given, as heads of thought, and as it were, a *Brief of Prayer*, are singularly suggestive in their nature, and thereby best adapted for general use, and to most variety of cases. Their language being principally drawn from Scripture, is common and acceptable to all, and at the same time, deep, rich, and universal, and suitable to all degrees of spiritual attainment.

Berrian.

FAMILY AND PRIVATE PRAYERS. BY THE REV. WM. BERRIAN, D.D., Rector of Trinity Church, New York. 12mo. Large type. $1.00.

In this large and well-executed volume, Dr. Berrian has furnished all who love the Liturgy and the spirit of the Prayer Book, with a most valuable manual; valuable alike for its freedom from all irreverent and unseemly familiarity of approach to the throne of grace, and for its deep and glowing fervour of devotion to God. The edition has been newly arranged and materially enlarged. Part of the additions which have been made to it consist of ancient litanies, purified from all taint of superstition and error, and presenting a perfect embodiment of Christian truth expressed in the most fervent strain of devotion.

DEVOTIONS FOR THE SICK ROOM, AND FOR TIMES OF TROUBLE, compiled from Ancient Liturgies and the Writings of Holy Men. From the London Edition, with alterations and additions. By the Rev. William Berrian, D.D., Rector of Trinity Church, New York. 12mo. 50 cents.

The want of a full and appropriate manual of devotion, adapted to the peculiar necessities, the changing circumstances, and diversified state and character of all who are in trouble or distress, has been often felt by the clergy, in their visitation of the sick and afflicted, and still more by the sufferers themselves. This want has now been fully supplied by Dr. Berrian, in the present volume, who, in order to give the manual, of which this is a reprint, a fuller adaptation to the wants of those for whom it is more especially designed, has pruned it of its redundancies, and added to it all the Prayers for the sick and afflicted which, in the course of his long ministry, and consequent great experience, he had been led to prepare, on various occasions, for cases of sorrow and trouble as they successively occurred.

ENTER INTO THY CLOSET; OR, THE CHRISTIAN'S DAILY COMPANION. Consisting of Prayers and Offices of Devotion, adapted to every State and Condition of Life, &c. By Wm. Berrian, D.D., Rector of Trinity Church, New York. 12mo. 50 cents.

This Manual of Private Prayers has been prepared by the experienced author, with the aid of the Liturgy, Ancient Litanies, and other sacred offices, and the devotional writings of the older divines of the Church of England; and is well calculated as a seasonable help to all who may use it, and especially to those who find it difficult to give utterance to their devout feelings in their own language, even in the secrecy of the closet.

Hobart.

THE CLERGYMAN'S COMPANION. BY JOHN HENRY HOBART, D.D., late Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New York. 12mo. Muslin, 75 cents; mor. flexible, in pocket-book form, $1.50.

This little volume contains the various Offices of the Church, from the Book of Common Prayer, in a size convenient for the pocket. It contains the "Office for Public Baptism of Infants;" "Private Baptism of Children;" "Baptism of those of Riper Years;" "Form for the Solemnization of Matrimony;" "Order for the Visitation of the Sick;" "Communion of the Sick;" "Burial of the Dead;" "Form of Prayer for the Visitation of Prisoners;" "Form of Prayer to be used in Families;" "The Collects throughout the Year;" "A Form of Prayer for the Fourth of July;" "Prayers suitable to be used in Legislative Bodies;" "Form of Prayer at the Laying of a Corner-stone of a Church or Chapel;" "Form of Prayer for Thanksgiving-day;" "Collects to be used during the prevalence of Asiatic Cholera;" besides, Prayers to be used on numerous other occasions. It is an indispensable companion for every clergyman.

Jackson, Rev. William.

SERMONS AND LIFE OF REV. WILLIAM JACKSON, LATE RECTOR of St. Paul's Church, Louisville, Ky. 1 vol. 8vo. $1.25.

Hobart, Rt. Rev. John Henry, D. D.

SERMONS OF THE RT. REV. JOHN HENRY HOBART, D.D., BISHOP of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York, with a Memoir of his Life by the Rev. William Berrian, D.D., Rector of Trinity Church, New York. 3 vols. 8vo. $4.50.

Cunningham, Rev. J. W., A. M.

SERMONS, CHIEFLY PRACTICAL, BY THE REV. J. W. CUNNINGHAM, A. M., Vicar of Harrow. 1 vol. 8vo. $1.25.

Plain Sermons,

BY CONTRIBUTORS TO THE "TRACTS FOR THE TIMES." 2 vols. 12mo. $1.50.

Duffie, Rev. Cornelius R., A. M.

SERMONS BY THE LATE REV. CORNELIUS R. DUFFIE, A.M., RECTOR of St. Thomas's Church, New York, with a Memoir of the Author. 2 vols. 8vo. $3.00.

Moore, Benjamin, D. D.

SERMONS BY BENJAMIN MOORE, D. D., LATE BISHOP OF THE PROTestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York. 2 vols. 8vo. $2.00.

Paget's Sermons.

ON THE DUTIES OF DAILY LIFE. 12mo. $1.00.

Ives, Rt. Rev. L. Silliman, D. D.

"THE OBEDIENCE OF FAITH," SEVEN SERMONS DELIVERED ON his Visitations to the Churches in his Diocese, during 1848–9, by Rt. Rev. L. Silliman Ives, D. D., Bishop of North Carolina.

Berens, Rev. Edward, M. A.

VILLAGE SERMONS ON THE CHIEF ARTICLES OF FAITH, &c., ON the Christian Character, and on some of the Relative Duties; to which is added, Pastoral Advice to Young Men, particularly those in country villages. In Seven Sermons. By the Rev. Edward Berens, M. A. 12mo. 75 cents.

Butler, Rev. C. M., D. D.

OLD TRUTHS AND NEW ERRORS. FOUR SERMONS BY THE REV. C. M. BUTLER, D. D., Rector of Trinity Church, Washington, D. C. 16mo. 50 cts.